DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 540 JC 800 518

AUTHOR McClenney, Byron N.
TITLE Management for Productivity.
INSTITUTION American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 126p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 410, Washington, DC 20036 ($5.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Administrative Organization; Administrators; Budgeting; *College Administration; *College Planning; *Community Colleges; Cost Effectiveness; Leadership Responsibility; Literature Reviews; *Measurement Techniques; Models; Outcomes of Education; *Productivity; Program Development; Self Evaluation (Groups); State of the Art Reviews; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Based on a review of the literature dealing with management in higher education, this five-part monograph examines the concept of educational productivity and explores its applications in community college administration. Part I presents an operational definition for "management," and discusses five components of the management task: planning, organizing, directing, coordinating departmental efforts, and controlling. The concepts of organizational "efficiency" and "effectiveness" are clarified in Part II, and various research efforts undertaken to quantifiably measure educational productivity are assessed. Parts III and IV concentrate on community college management activities relating to community assessment, the determination of institutional role, administrative organization, organizational climate, planning, budgeting, resource development, marketing, program development, personnel policies, management information systems, and institutional evaluation. Finally, Part V discusses the alternative instructional methodologies utilized by community colleges to increase productivity and suggests an empirical model for the productive management of labor-intensive, human service agencies. Case studies describing management practices at three representative community colleges are appended and bibliographies conclude each section of the paper. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191540

MANAGEMENT FOR PRODUCTIVITY

by
Byron N. McClenney

Copyright 1980

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. A. Harper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Printed in U.S.A.

Price: $5.00

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC800518

ISBN 0-87117-103-1

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank a number of colleagues for their assistance and contributions in the development of the manuscript. Dick Wilson of AACJC provided guidance throughout the project. Presidents Ron McCarter of Southeastern Community College (North Carolina), Don Carlyon of Delta College (Michigan), and Norm Watson (Chancellor) of the Coast Community College District (California) graciously consented to participate in the case studies. George Clovis, Dean of Administrative Services at Parkersburg, assisted in the interviews of personnel in the Coast District. Peggy Kessinger and Judy Higgs of Parkersburg read the manuscript and made many helpful suggestions. My wife Mary Ann and my secretary Debbie Richards typed the manuscript and corrected many of my errors. My sons, Mark and Don, were very understanding and supportive for which I shall always be grateful. I am thankful for the help, and assume full responsibility for any shortcomings.

Byron N. McClenney, President
Parkersburg Community College
Parkersburg, West Virginia
March 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Chapter 1 MANAGEMENT DEFINED
- Planning
- Organizing
- Directing
- Coordinating
- Controlling
- Summary
- References

Chapter 2 PRODUCTIVITY DEFINED
- Efficiency
- Effectiveness
- Elaboration on Productivity
- Summary
- References

Chapter 3 MANAGEMENT: STATE OF THE ART
- Community Assessment
- Mission, Role and Scope
- Organization
- Organizational Climate/Managerial Leadership
- References

Chapter 4 STATE OF THE ART: ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESSES
- Planning
- Resource Allocation/Budgeting
- Resource Development
- Marketing
- Program Development
- Personnel Systems
- Management Information Systems
- Evaluation
- References

Chapter 5 MANAGEMENT FOR PRODUCTIVITY
- The Present
- The Future
- References

MANAGEMENT DEFINED

MANAGEMENT - the act or art of managing: the conducting or supervising of something: judicious use of means to accomplish an end

MANAGE - to handle or direct with a degree of skill...(1)

Few community college educators would object to the idea that skillful college leaders should use sound judgement in conducting college operations in order for the institution to achieve the purpose for which it was created. That is the primary definition of management, and it is clear that the definition has positive overtones or implications. Given the positive statement, one is pushed to wonder why secondary definitions with negative dimensions would tend to dominate discussion in an educational forum. Keeping people under submission and manipulation are possible outcomes, but management conducted according to the positive statement is oriented toward a higher level of operation. People become the keys to whether a college functions in a healthy manner.

Bower (2) sees management as "the accomplishment of purpose through the organized effort of others." His idea seems to extend the traditional definition of "getting work done through people." The elements of purpose and organization are important to any conception of community college management. The focus on the role of people in the enterprise will also be central to any discussion of management and productivity. George (3) links the role of the manager with purpose and work environment when he says, "Determining the collective objectives of an undertaking and generating an environment for their achievement is the total function of a manager." The historical look at management thought by George (4) goes on to conclude:

> The managing process, therefore, is an eclectic unity - a oneness made up of a mixture of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling - each intermixed and involved in an inseparable whole.

The conception of management as a process, with certain functions viewed as integral parts, provides a useful definition for a look at community college administration or management. By defining the functions, one can reach a clearer understanding of how to approach structuring a college so that the purpose will be achieved. A function is "one of a group of related actions contributing to a larger action." (5) The larger action, management, and the component functions of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling provide the foundation on which to build a view of productive community college organizations. Add the function of coordination as described by Barnard (6) in his seminal work on management and the necessary "glue" for unity in management has been provided. He says,"...the quality of coordination is the crucial factor in the survival of organization."

PLANNING

What are we aiming to accomplish? What is our role? Why are we organized? These questions are among the ones to be answered by top administrators of community colleges if they fulfill the expectations held by society. The questions also imply the need for a sense of direction or a "reason for being" in higher education.

The dictionary (7) defines planning as "the establishment of goals, policies, and procedures ..." Drucker (8) goes beyond that definition by indicating the need for clear objectives and goals to be linked to a definition of function and mission. McManis Associates (9), in a publication for the U. S. Office of Education, go so far as to conceive of mission as the "apex," supported by goals and objectives. They assume the assessment of needs has preceded the formulation of the mission, goals, and objectives, and that performance evaluation measures and milestone projections are necessary managerial expressions of intent. Their conception clearly moves one from the long-range view of mission and goals to the short-range view of how an organization moves toward fulfilling a defined mission.

Meaningful planning should incorporate the look into the future as well as indicating the activities for the next year. The process of planning, to be described later, is a vital function of management, enabling boards and administrations to chart the course of the future.

ORGANIZING

How shall we function? How are people to be involved? What kind of structure will be most effective? Answers to these questions should be related to the thrust of planning, since the imperative is to have staff members contributing to the accomplishment of the goals. The dictionary (10) definition describes an organic structure and says that to organize is "to arrange or form into a coherent unity or functioning whole."

Most community college administrators are familiar with an organizational chart, but they seldom examine whether they have a "coherent unity" or a "functioning whole." The American Management Association (11) simply asks, "Who's involved ... and how?" Providing a clear answer to that question and implementing the dictionary definition will lead to productive practices within this function of management.

DIRECTING

Who will do the work? When should the work be done? What specifically needs to be done? Answers to these questions provide "building blocks" when one links the function of directing with planning and organizing. As the dictionary (12) indicates, direction provides "guidance or supervision of action or conduct." Assigning the work of the organization in a clear, orderly, and systematic manner is a necessary step for the community college administrator who is concerned about an institution reaching its stated goals.

COORDINATING

Who must be kept informed? What kind of information must be shared? Which groups must meet on a regular basis? Answering these questions, one begins to focus on ways to enhance communication and cooperation within a campus environment.

The dictionary (13) indicates that to coordinate is "to bring into a common action movement, or condition." The overlap with the reference to a "coherent unity" in the function of organizing is obvious. Coordinated efforts in an organization with clear work assignments, logical work groups, and well defined goals will lead toward productivity as it will be defined in this manuscript.

CONTROLLING

How do you evaluate results? By what standards do you measure outcomes? Who will assess results? The terms evaluation, appraisal, and review are common to community college administrators, even if they do not relate them to the controlling function of management. An administrator should be personally involved in this function to be sure that events conform to plans within a cost that society is willing to pay. To elaborate, the dictionary (14) says that to control is "to check, test or verify by evidence ... to exercise restraining or directing influence..." The reference to providing evidence is on target when one considers the calls for accountability being heard in most states. Careful review, appraisal or evaluation, and presentation of evidence take on fresh importance in the face of these cries for accountability and the "tax revolt."

SUMMARY

Five basic functions of management have been presented as components of the management process. Other writers might include topics like leading, motivating, communicating, team-building, decision-making, staffing, budgeting, marketing and evaluation. The contention here is that all of these vital elements are either incorporated within the basic functions or they come as a result of work in the basic functions. No matter how management is defined, it seems likely that community college administrators will focus increasing attention on how to manage. There will be a major thrust to develop skillful college leaders who will be able to use sound judgement in conducting college operations in order for the institution to achieve the purpose for which it was created. The wise administrator will also seek to learn what is known about management.

As Drucker (15) indicates,

> There are management tools and techniques. There are management concepts and principles. There is a common language of management. And there may even be a universal "discipline" of management. Certainly there is a worldwide generic function ...

Community college leaders will do well to face the demands for operational efficiency and educational effectiveness by seeking to utilize what is known to become better managers. Operational efficiency and educational effectiveness, concepts not yet clearly defined, will demand attention like never before. Educational productivity, a blending of the concepts, will be within the grasp of administrators who learn to plan, organize, direct, coordinate, and control.

REFERENCES

1. Woolf, Henry Bosley, Editor in Chief, Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1977), p. 697.

2. Bower, Joseph L., "Effective Public Management," Harvard Business Review (March - April, 1977), 132.

3. George, Claude S., Jr., The History of Management Thought (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice - Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 162.

4. Ibid., p. 166.

5. Woolf, op. cit., p. 465.

6. Barnard, Chester I., The Functions Of The Executive, Thirtieth Anniversary Edition (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 256.

7. Woolf, op. cit., p. 878.

8. Drucker, Peter F., "Managing The Public Service Institution," Public Interest, 33 (Fall, 1973), 43-60.

9. McManis Associates, Inc./University Associates, Inc., A Guide To The Development Of Mission, Goals, Objectives, Performance Evaluation Measures, and Milestones (Washington, D.C.).

10. Woolf, op. cit., p. 809.

11. The Professional Institute of AMA, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Presidents Management Seminar Dallas, Texas: October, 1974).

12. Woolf, op. cit., p. 323.

13. Ibid., p. 250.

14. Ibid., p. 247.

15. Drucker, Peter F., Technology, Management & Society (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970), p. 38.

PRODUCTIVITY DEFINED

PRODUCTIVITY - the quality or state of being productive

PRODUCTIVE - having the quality or power of producing esp. in abundance: effective in bringing about: yielding or furnishing results...(1)

A productive manager might be described as one who is effective in bringing about abundant results. The same could be said for a productive organization. Barnard (2) adds insight to the definition when he observes, "When a specific desired end is attained we shall say that the action is 'effective.'" The reference to a desired end reflects the definition of management with the implicit idea that someone has defined the end or purpose. Barnard recognizes the importance of purpose and stresses the commitment of employees to the purposes of an organization. Roueche and others (3) similarly point out that:

> Results (the fulfillment of objectives) which allow the college to accomplish its mission permit the institution and its personnel to be accountable to the constituency served by the college.

Purpose or mission, therefore, assumes a central role in the discussion of both management and productivity. Lawrence (4) summarizes:

> ...the new accountability appears to call for a clear statement of purpose prior to the expenditure of funds as a yardstick against which to measure effectiveness.

The introduction of "expenditure of funds" in the discussion leads to another element one must consider when thinking about accountability or productivity. As Hartnett (5) points out:

> ... accountability experts are concerned with effectiveness and efficiency (its capacity to achieve results with a given expenditure of resources), and very often they are more interested in the latter.

Effectiveness and efficiency, concepts often noted in discussions of accountability and productivity, are central to the discussion and must be understood in order to consider an application of these concepts in the management of community colleges.

EFFICIENCY

Efficiency can be defined as "effective operation as measured by a comparison of production with cost."(6) Lawrence (7), however, sees the concept in terms of a "program's capacity to achieve the intended results within a given expenditure of resources." Noteworthy in the definitions are the terms "effective operation" and "intended results." There appears to be agreement regarding the inclusion of costs in the definition. In the first definition, cost is linked with effectiveness, which in itself must be evaluated. In the second definition, cost is linked with intended results, which implies that desired results must be identified before efficiency can be measured. Both definitions imply that efficiency is more than just cost control or curtailment.

Another conception of efficiency is being developed at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). Romney, Gray, and Weldon (8) view efficiency as a comparison of actual results with actual expenditures. This view does not attempt to take into account the difference between "intended results" or outcomes and actual results. It should be pointed out that they include commitment, utilization, and effectiveness in their definition of productivity; each of which will receive attention as a definition of productivity is formulated. Hartnett (9) seems to use this narrow view of efficiency in describing the traditional clash of a college financial officer, concerned about efficiency, with faculty members who resist any restraints on their striving for educational effectiveness.

Barnard (10) introduced another thought about efficiency which will prove to be helpful in finally defining productivity. He said that efficiency of effort "... is efficiency relative to the securing of necessary personal contributions to the cooperative system." In other words, the commitment of staff members is necessary in order to increase efficiency.

EFFECTIVENESS

Effectiveness can be defined in terms of "producing a decided, decisive, or desired effect."(11) Lawrence (12) elaborates:"...effectiveness refers to the degree to which the program succeeds in doing what was intended." The emphasis is on the "desired effect" rather than on simply producing a "decisive effect." Once again, implicit in the definition is the idea that desirable outcomes have been described.

Barnard (13) provided substance for a working definition when he says effectiveness

> ...relates exclusively to the appropriateness of the means selected under the conditions as a whole for the accomplishment of the final objective.

To translate, a manager must consider the working environment or climate in selecting appropriate steps to take in moving the organization toward accomplishment of its purpose. To extend the thought, an action taken to increase efficiency in the immediate future, but which is disruptive in the long-term view, could not be described as effective.

ELABORATION ON PRODUCTIVITY

The thought of pursuing productivity in an educational setting was foreign to educators prior to the push for accountability. Now, many agree with Haggerty (14) when he says:

> The concept of productivity is just as valid in education as it is in the production of goods or food.

He points out that the only way we can improve our standard of living is through improvement in output per man-hour. He even goes so far as to say:

> ...the employees of the education industry have been completely dependent for any real gains in their own incomes these past decades upon the increasing productivity of the other sectors of the economy.

His conclusions seem to be based on the traditional conception of productivity described by Sibson (15).

$$\text{Productivity} = \frac{\text{physical output}}{\text{total man-hours of work}}$$

Using the above-mentioned definition, Haggerty would, for example, look for improved student-instructor ratios when expenditures are increased for facilities, equipment and supplies. Without trying to refute the example as a legitimate part of a quest for productivity, the point should be made that it is only a portion of what productivity means in an educational environment. Adopting the industrial conception of productivity demands that educators move toward greater quantification of results. In fact, extensive efforts have been undertaken to assist college managers to cope with external pressure for accountability.

Lawrence and Service (16) provide an excellent review of the quest for a quantitative language to assist the manager who wants to employ quantitative management techniques in higher education. They conclude:

> Management, especially management of higher education, is simply too complex a task to be reduced to a set of routinized numerical procedures. (17)

They then describe the need to

> ...synthesize a plan of action from two aspects of reality: (1) a world of people, human values, preferences, aspirations, and interpersonal dynamics and (2) a world of things, facts, dollars, resources, and constraints. The creativity of this synthesis is the fundamental measure of a higher education manager's effectiveness. (18)

Lawrence and Service (19) further state that the

> ...major challenge is the need to focus more on the effectiveness or end results of higher education, as opposed to the efficiency methodologies or means used to reach those ends.

They conclude by raising "... serious doubts about the operational viability of the concept of productivity in higher education." (20)

One should not feel compelled to accept the conclusions of Haggerty, Lawrence and Service. Exploration should, however, continue along the lines suggested by Lawrence and Service. The focus can be on "end results," if a new conception of productivity can be developed. Sibson (21) suggests a qualitative productivity measure:

$$\text{Productiveness} = \frac{\text{correctness of action} + \text{measure of output} - \text{disruptive effect}}{\text{total man-hours of work}}$$

The model, still in a conceptual state, causes one to take a long-range view of educational productivity. Appropriateness of actions, measurement of results or outcomes, and the long-term effects of an action would be taken into account. Most community college administrators have seen that "experimental change itself can produce higher productivity in the short run." (22) The challenge is to make progress for the "long run" in an environment which must be judged to be different from the business and industrial world.

As Dyer (23) has said:

> It must be constantly kept in mind that the educational process is not on all fours with an industrial process; it is a social process in which human beings are continually interacting with other human beings in ways that are imperfectly measurable or predictable.

Romney, Gray and Weldon (24) seem to recognize this difference in education as they define productivity. Productivity is seen as meeting the expectations of constituencies efficently and effectively. The introduction of constituencies is an important step in understanding how a thrust for productivity can make sense to a community college administrator. As Lenning and others (25) indicate, multiple perspectives of students, employers, funders, civic leaders, faculty and trustees must be taken into account. In reviewing the list of those who hold expectations for the community college, one is pushed to realize the complexity of the issue of measuring educational productivity.

Goodwin and Young (26), in reviewing the varying definitions of increasing educational productivity, state in operational terms some of the elements which might emerge to demonstrate productivity. They are:

1. lowering the cost of producing a unit of education
2. increasing the learning of students
3. making the staff more efficient
4. making the community college more accessible to a wider range of students
5. cutting attrition rates
6. increasing administrative efficiency

7. managing the physical plant more effectively, including the use of energy

The above-mentioned elements incorporate both efficiency and effectiveness, but they may not focus enough on purpose and commitment. If one assumes that the elements are all consistent with purpose, then they are helpful in understanding the concept of educational productivity. It should also be recognized that progress along the suggested lines could not be made without the commitment of college personnel.

SUMMARY

A college which is able to satisfy its constituencies (meeting real needs within a tolerable cost) might be described as a productive organization. It is likely to be an organization with clear statements of purpose and goals in which college personnel join in a commitment to move the institution toward satisfying its constituencies. It is also likely to be an organization in which a long-range view of educational productivity is developed. Short-range efforts to increase operational efficiency may be expended, but the efforts will not be seen as "ends," but rather will be viewed as "means" to a desired end.

REFERENCES

1. Woolf, Henry Bosley, Editor in Chief, Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1977), p. 918.
2. Barnard, Chester I., The Functions Of The Executive, Thirtieth Anniversary Edition (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 19.
3. Roueche, John E., George A. Baker III and Richard L. Brownell, Accountability And The Community College, (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1971), p. 24.
4. Lawrence, Ben, Statewide Planning For Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design, Lyman A. Glenny and George B. Weathersby, eds. (Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE, September, 1971), p. 12.
5. Hartnett, Rodney T., Accountability in Higher Education (Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971), p. 5.
6. Woolf, op. cit., p. 362.
7. Lawrence, op. cit., p. 13.
8. Romney, Leonard C., Robert G. Gray and H. Kent Weldon, "Departmental Productivity: A Conceptual Framework," Internal Document (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978).
9. Hartnett, op. cit., p. 6.
10. Barnard, op. cit., p. 92.
11. Woolf, op. cit., p. 362.
12. Lawrence, op. cit., p. 12.
13. Barnard, op. cit., p. 236.
14. Haggerty, Patrick E., Productivity In Education (Dallas, Texas: Texas Instruments Incorporated, 1974), p. 20.
15. Sibson, Robert E., Increasing Employee Productivity (New York: AMACOM, 1976), p. 48.

16. Lawrence, G. Ben and Allan L. Service, Editors. Quantitative Approaches to Higher Education Management: Potential, Limits, and Challenge (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education and American Association for Higher Education, 1977).

17. Ibid., p. 11.

18. Ibid., pps. 11-12.

19. Ibid., p. 79.

20. Ibid., p. 80.

21. Sibson, op. cit., p. 49.

22. Goodwin, Gregory and James C. Young, Increasing Productivity In The Community College (Los Angeles, California: League for Innovation in the Community College and ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, July, 1978), p. 9.

23. Dyer, Henry S., "Toward Objective Criteria of Professional Accountability in the Schools of New York City," Phi Delta Kappan (LII, No. 4, December, 1970), 211.

24. Romney, Gray and Weldon, op. cit..

25. Lenning, Oscar T., Yong S. Lee, Sidney S. Micek, and Allan L. Service, A Structure for the Outcomes of Postsecondary Education (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977).

26. Goodwin and Young, op. cit., p. 4.

MANAGEMENT: STATE OF THE ART

> The managing process, therefore, is an eclectic unity - a oneness made up of a mixture of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling - each intermixed and involved in an inseparable whole. (1)
>
> ...the quality of coordination is the crucial factor in the survival of organization. (2)

Only in recent years have community college administrators begun to focus on management concepts. Planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling were certainly practiced, but little attention was directed toward improvement of these functions. Richardson (3), writing in 1970, observed that a review of Junior College Journal articles written during the previous three years revealed only one "authoritative" article dealing with administrative structure or concepts. The Higher Education Management Institute (HEMI) (4) recently observed:

> The higher education research literature rarely deals with management and training. Five graduate research assistants found only about 600 citations over the past ten years related in any way to management development and training of higher education. The great majority of these were doctoral dissertation studies on limited populations, making comparisons difficult.

The HEMI survey indicated that most studies simply described position tasks or responsibilities.

> The paucity of the literature dealing with higher education management led the Institute to a review of basic literature on theories of organizational functioning and human effectiveness. (5)

HEMI "believes that to the extent that management is a generic function of human organizations, lessons learned from research in other areas can benefit colleges and universities." (6)

A large number of college and university leaders agree that higher education managers can learn from "what is known" about organizational behavior and management. A total of 557 institutions expressed interest, and then 454 institutions sought participation in the Exxon Education Foundation funded program at HEMI. (7) Many of the institutions were community colleges, and eight community colleges were finally selected to participate in the pilot program along with 16 senior colleges and universities. The community colleges were:

1. Central YMCA (Illinois)
2. Community College of Allegheny County (Pennsylvania)
3. Community College of Denver (Colorado)
4. College of Lake County (Illinois)
5. Eastfield College and the Dallas County Community College District Office (Texas)
6. J. Sargeant Reynolds (Virginia)
7. Los Rios Community College (California)
8. New York City (New York)

De Anza (California) Community College later became one of the pilot institutions in this management development training program. The program was launched by Exxon funding in April, 1976, and continues today with numerous community colleges joining now that the pilot phase is complete.

Additional evidence of community college involvement in management improvement can be found in a review of Title III funding. (8) A total of 68 two-year colleges received "Basic" funding and 23 received "Advanced" funding during the fiscal year, 1977. Most of the grants provide for major work in what HEMI calls management development. In fact, a primary thrust for AIDP programs is in an activity called Planning, Management and Evaluation (PME). Administrative Improvement (AI) is also included to focus on the development of individual managers. Several community colleges, including Parkersburg Community College (West Virginia),

J. Sargeant Reynolds (Virginia), and Central YMCA (Illinois), are involved in both HEMI and AIDP.

Title III funding is also assisting more than 100 community colleges through the ACCTion Consortium. (9) This technical assistance project, in its fourth year, is serving 116 two-year colleges in 39 states. The initial thrust of ACCTion was to strengthen programs in community services, instructional services, resource development, and student development services. The efforts have now expanded to include long-range planning, management development, and management style. Through workshops, institutes, and consulting, the Consortium is working to enhance the management of community colleges.

The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) (10), funded in large part by the National Institute of Education, has published more than 70 documents dealing with the planning and management of higher education. Classification structures, management information systems, facilities planning, cost analysis, data dictionaries, information exchange, and state planning are examples of topics addressed and work undertaken at NCHEMS since 1970. Emphasis is now being placed on measures of educational outcomes ("desired results"), planning, and community assessment. Community colleges have been involved in numerous NCHEMS projects, and have, in recent years, taken a leadership role in helping to advance the "state of the art."

Three community colleges helped develop an approach to community-impact studies. Eastfield College (Dallas, Texas), Kalamazoo Valley (Michigan), and Valencia Community College (Orlando, Florida) were involved in an effort to determine the impact a college is having in the community, and to identify directions for the future. The results of the pilot studies have been published (11) and workshops were scheduled to encourage other community colleges to undertake similar studies. A case study of the Kansas City Metropolitan Community Colleges is included in another NCHEMS publication (12) on academic planning. The case studies resulted from work started in 1973 designed to improve planning and management in postsecondary education.(13) The Community College of Philadelphia and Golden West (California) College had representatives involved in guiding another publication (12) on institutional planning. Eastfield College (Dallas, Texas) also served as one of four resource institutions in the development of a handbook. A series of "Executive Briefings" for community college administrators followed the completion of the project. NCHEMS is continuing to develop approaches with particular importance for community colleges.(15, 16, 17)

The program for the tenth annual "Institute for Educational Management" illustrates the heightened interest in management one is able to observe in all higher education circles. The program (18) includes the topics:

Control and Planning Systems
Labor Relations
Law and Higher Education
Management Information Systems
Managing Financial Resources
Organizational Behavior and Design
Personnel Policy and Administration
Analysis of The Environment

The topics might have been taken from a program of the AACJC, the Association of Community College Trustees, The League for Innovation in the Community College, or any one of dozens of state associations or professional organizations with an interest in the future of community colleges. The point is, college administrators must face the reality of stabilizing enrollment, declining resources and cries for accountability by becoming better managers. The search for "better ways" should start in the community served by the college.

COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT

The widespread shift in name from "junior college" to "community college" indicated a level of institutional commitment to base programs on the needs of specific communities. In fact, a recent survey indicated that 95.7% of 819 responding colleges have a common understanding of community education. Young, Fletcher and Rue (19) report the response to the following definition of community education:

> courses and activities for credit or noncredit, formal classroom or nontraditional programs, cultural, recreational offerings specifically designed to meet the needs of the surrounding community and utilizing school, college, and other facilities. Programming is determined with input from the community being served.

The survey, focusing on one facet of mission or purpose, points out the need for "input from the community." How can a community college obtain the proper "input" so that it can structure itself to satisfy the constituencies? Each community college must answer the question if it is going to be well managed and productive. It may be time, in fact, for colleges to take a "refresher" course in the "basics."

Johnson (20) indicates that community colleges should

> Use lay advisory committees in the development of technical-vocational curricula; also consider using them in developing general education offerings. Plan to have these committees, whose membership will periodically change, serve continuously both during the period of establishment and after establishment as an ongoing aid to revising and strengthening the curriculum.

He also stressed the importance of surveying the "interests, plans, and goals of high school juniors and seniors." (21) If the Johnson work had been done in 1978, he would have included the other constituencies to be "satisfied" in 1979.

NCHEMS (22) identified potential constituencies in work with the three community colleges. Questionnaires and procedures were developed to survey:

- Citizens
- Civic Leaders
- Educators
- Employers
- Faculty and Staff
- Feeder School Faculty and Counselors
- Graduating High School Seniors
- Social Service Agency Administrators
- Students

"Input" from all of the above-mentioned sources is important to any community college concerned with whether it is utilizing its resources to meet "desired ends."

Community needs may also be assessed and met through collaborative ventures with public school districts. Examples of an evolving partnership can be found in the experiences described by Voorhees, King and Cwik.(23) Clackamas (Oregon), Iowa Central (Iowa), Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, and Washtenaw (Michigan) were all involved in developing community education programs for their respective communities. Efforts were extended to define roles for the community college and the public schools. These approaches, if successful, can demonstrate accountability to the constituencies by the avoidance of unnecessary duplication.

Local boards, either elected or appointed, generally provide the legal or formal link to the community, but they cannot possibly provide all the "input" needed. Use of advisory committees, formal surveys and linking with other community agencies, including employment services, can provide the understanding of needs which is so vital if community colleges are to fulfill their potential. Most community colleges have some kind of advisory committee structure, and many have done some community survey work, but a systematic program is needed to yield information on a regular basis. Community assessment information will be useful in establishing or reviewing institutional mission, as well as serving to "chart" needed new directions.

MISSION, ROLE AND SCOPE

> Having passed through its adolescence, a community college must develop rigorous operational definitions of its educational missions. In the past, as community colleges were groping for their place, both extravagant expectations and exaggerated promises of performance were manifest. (24)

Blocker talks about the need for a sharper image; a clearer definition of a "sense of direction" or a "reason for being" in higher education. McManis Associates (25) assume that a needs assessment must precede the formulation of mission, and Lawrence (26) points out that a clear statement of purpose (mission) provides the "yardstick against which to measure effectiveness." The concept of mission, then, takes on a pivotal role in planning and measurement of productivity.

Interest in reviewing mission statements is being motivated by a variety of forces. All AIDP grants call for such a review, many states are getting involved (e.g., West Virginia), and the push for accountability demands a thorough review. Competition for students, one of the reasons that states are involved, must also be considered a motivating factor. Clark (27) in discussing a movement toward centralization says:

> If we must plan and coordinate at higher levels, as we must to some degree, then we should be deliberately attempting to separate and anchor institutional roles.

If community colleges "separate and anchor" their roles, they will be in a good position not only to cope with external realitites, but they will be ready to manage for productivity.

Equally important to this discussion is the extent to which college personnel share a commitment to help the institution move toward accomplishment of the mission or purpose. The importance of commitment, an idea discussed in the definitions of management and productivity, will resurface throughout this discussion as efforts are made to paint the "big picture" of institutional efficiency and effectiveness.

Accrediting associations speak to the concern of mission in their standards, thereby providing an opportunity for an institution to review its mission on a regular basis. As the Southern Association (28) says:

> Each institution should clearly define its purpose and should incorporate this definition into a statement which is a pronouncement of its role in the educational world. The institution's integrity is measured not only in terms of its stated purpose, but also in terms of its conscientious endeavor to fulfill this purpose.

An institution will be unable to be "conscientious" without the commitment of staff. It must also take seriously the charge to examine the purpose when the opportunity is afforded.

Virtually all community colleges have dealt with the definition of mission as a result of one of the above-mentioned motivating forces. The effectiveness of the work, however, depends on the answers to some critical questions. Have community needs assessments provided the basis for the definition? Were campus personnel involved in developing the statement? Is the institution organized in a manner consistent with the mission? Does the mission statement serve as a basis for planning?

Affirmative answers to the questions would seem to indicate that an institution is well on the way toward achieving educational productivity. The next step is to link an understanding of need and the articulation of purpose with an organization designed to achieve the "desired ends."

ORGANIZATION

> Organization is the structural arrangement which provides for the processes of governance, management, and leadership. It is a bringing together of purpose and people. Organization is the structure of power and work activity. More than an arrangement for formulating purpose, it is an arrangement for translating purpose into performance.(29)

Millett has summarized the task, the result of which should be the "coherent unity" or "functioning whole" discussed in the earlier definition of organizing. Community colleges, however, have not always been organized according to the idea of linking "purpose and people." As Collins (30) indicates:

> When community/junior colleges began to develop, slowly in the first half of this century and rapidly during the last two decades, they were built according to the university departmental model, even though it poorly fitted their purposes.

The difficulty was that student-centered and learning-oriented institutions were adopting a structure which tended to be faculty-oriented and teaching-centered.

A line-and-staff organizational structure emerged which did not always take into account the basic principles of organization found to operate effectively in business and industry. The American Management Association (31) has described the following principles:

1. Unity of Command
2. Span of Control
3. Delegation
4. Specialization

The idea that no person can serve two "masters" is implicit in the definition of "unity of command." "Span of control" incorporates the complexity of the work, administrative style, and required interaction to determine how many people can or should report to a manager. The answer is usually found in the range of four to seven. "Delegation" includes responsibility (obligation to take action), authority (right to fulfill responsibilities), and accountability (can never be completely delegated). Finally, "specialization" leads to the grouping of related functions. In summary, if an administrator knows to whom he reports, supervises a reasonable number of staff members whose functions are related, and receives authority equal to responsibility, then he will have an opportunity to be a productive manager. Several questions emerge, however, to spoil this ideal view of organization.

How does one deal with the president who erodes the authority of his subordinates? How many deans of instruction attempt to supervise a dozen or more department heads? How many mid-level administrators feel that they have almost no authority? How often are reporting relationships determined on the basis of personalities? Is it difficult to determine who can make a final decision? The questions could go on, but the point is that many community colleges have never sought to apply the above-mentioned principles of organization. If they are applied, they might not operate without proper coordination and direction of work within the institution.

The contention here is that any organizational structure can work if community needs are known, staff members are committed to the mission, work assignments are clear, coordination leads to collaborative efforts, and managers know the type of performance expected. It might be more effective following an analysis and modification of structure in relationship to mission, but it can work. Community colleges are probably like other organizations in that they struggle with principles of organization. Sibson (32) observes "...not much authority is really delegated in many enterprises today." He has further insight: "Actually, delegation of authority really means the right to do the right things in an approved way only." Managerial or leadership style, a topic still to be addressed, obviously impacts the ability of an organization to function as a "coherent unity." The relative ability of an institution to change the structure must also be considered.

Guth (33) shares some propositions about behavior and decision-making which he believes to be generic:

1. Organizations do not respond in far-sighted, flexible ways to non-standard problems.
2. Organizations have limited flexibility and change only incrementally except in crisis.
3. Organizations are blunt instruments; projects which require that several units work together smoothly are not likely to succeed.
4. Projects which require major departures from routines are rarely accomplished as desired.
5. Leaders can inevitably expect distorted information from sub-unit managers and automatically should design counter-strategies to compensate for their distortions.
6. When an assigned piece of a plan goes against established sub-unit goals, there will be resistance to implementing it.

Ask any community college president who has initiated major organizational change and he or she will attest to the validity of the propositions. Administrators must start with "what is" and work carefully toward educational productivity. Administrators of new colleges, on the other hand, have an opportunity to create appropriate structures related to the mission.

The new wave of community colleges, noncampus colleges as described by Lombardi (34), offers exciting opportunities to bring together "purpose and people." The colleges described by Lombardi are:

1. Whatcom Community College (Washington)
2. Community College of Vermont
3. Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study (California)
4. Chicago City-Wide College
5. Chicago Urban Skills Institute
6. Pioneer Community College (Kansas City)
7. Coastline Community College (California)
8. Los Angeles Office for New Dimensions

"The department or division unit, so prominent in campus colleges is absent or plays a minor role." (35) Most of the colleges have dropped student activities, and most have organized geographical sub-units called "field sites," "instructional centers," "regional areas," or "program areas." All of the colleges have developed a central office or headquarters for administrative and support personnel. All have organized with the hope that barriers to access will be eliminated. Most of the institutions appear to have considered the principle of specialization by grouping related activities. Lombardi (36) summarizes the three organizational developments worthy of special notice:

> One is the subordination or elimination of the department/division as a unit in the administrative organization...
>
> A second organizational change, that may be considered a replacement for the department/division, is the geographical subadministrative units or/and the functional units...
>
> The third change is the absence of the traditional student government and extra-curricular activities at the noncampus colleges in multicampus districts...

It should also be noted that the colleges primarily serve part-time students and are staffed in the main by part-time instructors. They do present a good example of community colleges endeavoring to organize in a manner to achieve purpose.

Another model, described by Collins (37), is the "cluster college" concept. He indicates that his model is not Evergreen Valley College, Los Medanos College, Indian Valley College, Cypress College or Chabot College, but he does acknowledge these innovative institutions as having an influence on his thinking. Career categories (e.g., medical services) provide the organizational themes for centers of students and staff. He says "...people and programs are brought together because they have something in common." Each center would serve approximately 400 students with 13 instructors and one counselor. Four centers would form a cluster of 1,600 students. Collins (38) introduces a touch of reality, however, when he says: "The structural change most fraught with problems would be that of changing a traditional college into a cluster college." He does go on to cite Du Page College (Illinois), De Anza College (California), and Chabot College (California) as having success with mini-colleges operating within traditional colleges.

The entire discussion regarding organization may be academic if there are problems between the chief executive and the policy-making body or the chief executive and the head of a multi-institution system. As King and Breuder (39) indicate,

> For a board and president to operate at peak effectiveness, it is necessary that each has an unconditional positive regard for the other and that both are dedicated to the stated philosophy, mission, goals, and objectives of the institution.

If the "positive regard" does not exist, then the best organizational structure based on careful needs assessment and the complete articulation of mission cannot overcome the negative impact.

Perhaps as Bushnell and Zagaris (40) suggest,

> New organizational structures will emerge which encourage those who should participate in decision making to do so. The typical bureaucratic structure of the past with its hierarchical alignment of administrators, staff, and students will give way to a participatory management framework with both faculty and administrators serving as "learning managers."

The "bureaucratic structure" and the "hierarchical alignment" still predominate, however, and pressures exist which serve to reinforce these more traditional patterns. Garbarino (41) documents the development of institutional systems that brought together numbers of campuses into larger administrative units. He summarizes (42):

> The increase in bureaucratization of the institution is multiplied in the multicampus institutions and the multi-institutional systems, which have grown so dramatically during the past two decades. In these systems the problems of participation and coordination on a single campus are compounded.

He concludes (43):

> The growth in the size of institutions, the shift to public institutions, the creation of multicampus institutions and multi-institutional systems, and the trend toward consolidated coordinating agencies-all push decision making on major problems farther from the individual faculty member, his department, and other colleagues with common interests. In the process of adapting to these changes, strains are placed on existing faculty governance mechanisms, and one of the modifications of the traditional pattern that has appeared is the faculty union.

In the face of bureaucratization and unionization, the only hope for achieving educational productivity may reside in the organizational climate in which the work is done. Careful needs assessment, articulation of the mission or purpose, and application of the principles of organization can certainly enhance the potential for a healthy organizational climate.

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE/MANAGERIAL LEADERSHIP

> ...we believe that an institution is well managed when it has:
>
> ...Developed an organizational structure and climate that fosters a high degree of motivation among its managers and staff and a climate conducive to working together toward the institutional goals and objectives.(44)

Implicit in the above-mentioned assumption suggested by HEMI is the belief that managers set the "tone" or establish the climate for the institution. Another of their basic assumptions "is that an improvement in the effectiveness of college...management will lead to an improvement in institutional effectiveness." (45) Institutional effectiveness is viewed in terms of outcomes, a topic to be addressed later, while the management effectiveness views are based on the work of Rensis Likert. (46)

> In conceptual terms, the model consists of a set of causal management variables which significantly relate to a set of intervening work group variables, which in turn relate to a set of end result or outcome variables

Organization climate and leader behavior are among the "causal variables" which can be modified by college leaders. These variables, along with organization policy and procedures, organization structure, and objectives and programs are viewed as determinants of organizational effectiveness.(47)

Better performance, as measured by objective end results in a variety of organizational settings, is likely to be attained when Likert's "Group Interaction: Collaborative" system is the prevailing pattern. A leader or manager acts as follows:

> When decisions appropriate for his level need to be made, the...leader habitually uses group meetings, rather than individual conferences, to develop the maximum relevant information. He invites the open participation of as many members of his immediate work group as can conveniently attend... He not only obtains a candid up-down exchange of ideas,

> but also promotes lateral exchange of views and information and critique among all participants....If there is no group consensus on the best way to proceed, he readily makes the decision...(48)

The community colleges involved in the HEMI process are going through an internal needs assessment, part of which is designed to measure the degree to which authoritarian or participative patterns of leader and group behavior are employed. The research results of this work will have significant implications for all community colleges concerned about institutional effectiveness.

Colleges involved in ACCTion have also focused on management style and organization climate. A total of 74 presidents recently participated in a workshop utilizing "The Managerial Grid" developed by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton.(49) What can one learn from the grid?

> In any managerial environment, the basic conflict is people versus production. Some executives are product-oriented, and others are people-oriented. Some are indecisive, some avoid conflict, and some cause conflict. But no matter what style you are, the reaction of the people you manage, your associates, or your managers may be different from what you intend...Using the grid theory, you can learn to identify your style and recognize others' reaction to it.

The ideal on the grid is "Team Management" in which "production is from integration of task and human requirements into a unified system of interplay towards organizational goals." This high concern for people and production is compatible with the "Group Interaction: Collaborative" system developed by Likert.

The examples cited regarding the involvement of community colleges in seeking to understand manager or leader behavior and its impact on the organization are indicative of a growing interest. In discussing the "state of the art," it would be premature to draw conclusions about whether what has been observed in other organizations will hold true in community colleges. Participative patterns of leader and group interaction, or delegative management styles would certainly be favored, however, if the environments prove to be similar.

Sibson (50), in reviewing the history of delegative management, said: "Delegative management is not really a new idea, nor is it a discovery." He reviewed participative management (results were often higher costs and counterproductive incentives), X and Y theories (dealt with the balance between management of things and management of people), organizational development (a "fad"), job enrichment, and open systems of management. He concluded:

> Common to all these theories and some lesser personnel practices is one underlying idea - the recognition that an essential element of human resources management is to have employees who do the work to be a meaningful part of structuring the work.

Sibson (51) also noted the importance of a "climate of organizational trust" and the "expectation of excellence" if an organization is to have effective delegative management.

Sibson refers to the work of Douglas McGregor (X and Y theories) who is quoted as often as any other theorist. Views from McGregor, following work as a college president (Antioch), might be helpful to one seeking to understand how to strike a balance between providing for participation and making decisions. McGregor (52) says:

> I believed...that a leader could operate successfully as a kind of adviser to his organization. I thought I could avoid being a "boss." Unconsciously, I suspect, I hoped to duck the unpleasant necessity of making difficult decisions, of taking the responsibility for one course of action among many uncertain alternatives, of making mistakes and taking the consequences. I thought that maybe I could operate so that everyone

> would like me - that "good human relations" would eliminate all discord and argument.
>
> I couldn't have been more wrong...I finally began to realize that a leader cannot avoid the exercise of authority any more than he can avoid responsibility for what happens to his organization.

With that statement, it sounds like McGregor moved to an understanding of the Likert "group interactive-collaborative" model in which the leader makes a decision in the absence of a consensus.

Hall (53) indicates that the manager can make a choice to achieve or not. In his view, the high achiever chooses an integrative style of management. He "...values people just as highly as the accomplishment of production goals." Another way of stating that view was indicated in the reference to the work of Blake and Mouton. The references are to the kind of manager who is concerned about maintaining a healthy organizational climate and involving people in the process while at the same time getting the work done with a high level of efficiency. According to Hall,

> Participative practices are favored by him over unilaterally directive or lame duck prescriptive measures.

Hodgkinson (54), in commenting on conditions leading toward educational productivity, says that the manager will:

> Establish a generally democratic governance structure which permits many people to exercise leadership yet permits effective decision making.

What is being described is between an autocratic approach,which may be efficient,and a laissez-faire approach,which might produce staff contentment and little productivity. Pray (55), however, suggests a different perspective when he says

> ...there exists no widespread consensus on the special style, behavior, and problems of

> administration of community colleges which should enhance chances of success in the position (president).

How is one to judge success: in terms of retention of a job or achievement of educational productivity?

If success is to be judged in terms of educational productivity, then Cohen and Roueche (56) may have the best definition of a leader.

> A leader is one who moves the group toward its goals. The quality of leadership does not necessarily relate to the leader's being liked or feared by group members. The essential is that there be effect. Without group movement toward defined ends, there has been, by definition, no leadership exerted."

Bennis (57) adds perspective:

> The difference between routine and non-routine tasks is the difference between management and leadership.

The manager who has decided "to achieve" is going to be "out front," planning and structuring organizational processes so that educational productivity can be achieved.

REFERENCES

1. George, Claude S., Jr., The History of Management Thought (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 166.
2. Barnard, Chester I., The Functions Of The Executive, Thirtieth Anniversary Edition (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 256.
3. Richardson, Richard C., "Needed: New Directions in Administration," Junior College Journal (March, 1970), 16-22.
4. Higher Education Management Institute, "A Seminar for Community College Administrators on the Management Development and Training Program for Colleges and Universities," Program Introduction (Coconut Grove, Florida: HEMI, 1977), p. 14.
5. Ibid., p. 15.
6. Ibid., p. 15.
7. Ibid., p. 8.
8. Advisory Council On Developing Institutions, Strengthening Developing Institutions, Title III Of The Higher Education Act Of 1965 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March, 1978).
9. ACCTion Consortium, Suite 1500-North Bldg., 955 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20024.
10. NCHEMS, P.O. Drawer P, Boulder, Colorado 80302
11. Armijo, J. Frank, Sidney S. Micek, and Edward M. Cooper, Conducting Community-Impact Studies: A Handbook for Community Colleges (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978).
12. Kieft, Raymond N., Academic Planning: Four Institutional Case Studies (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978).
13. Ibid., vii.
14. Kieft, Raymond N., Frank Armijo, and Neil S. Bucklew, A Handbook for Institutional Academic and Program Planning: From Idea to Implementation (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978).
15. Lenning, Oscar T., Previous Attempts to Structure Educational Outcomes and Outcome-Related Concepts: A Compilation and Review of the Literature (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977).

16. Lenning, Oscar T., *The Outcomes Structure: An Overview and Procedures For Applying it in Postsecondary-Education Institutions* (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977).

17. Lenning, Oscar T., Yong S. Lee, Sidney S. Micek, and Allan L. Service, *A Structure for the Outcomes of Postsecondary Education* (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977).

18. Institute for Educational Management, "Tenth Annual Management Development Program for College and University Administrators," Harvard University, June-July, 1979.

19. Young, Robert B., Suzanne M. Fletcher and Robert R. Rue, *Directions For The Future: An Analysis Of The Community Services Dimension of Community Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Community Education, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in cooperation with The Office of Community Education Research, University of Michigan, April, 1978), p. 4.

20. Johnson, B. Lamar, *Starting A Community College* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964), p. 9.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

22. Armijo, Micek and Cooper, *op. cit.*

23. Van Voorhees, Curtis, Marilyn J. King, and Peter J. Cwik, *Community College - Community School Cooperation* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, March, 1977).

24. Blocker, Clyde E., "A National Agenda for Community and Junior Colleges," *An Agenda for National Action*, Report of the 1972 Assembly (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973), p. 127.

25. McManis Associates, Inc./University Associates, Inc., *A Guide To The Development Of Mission, Goals, Objectives, Performance Evaluation Measures, and Milestones* (Washington, D.C.).

26. Lawrence, Ben, *Statewide Planning For Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design*, Lyman A. Glenny and George Weathersby, eds. (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, September, 1971), p. 12.

27. Clark, Burton R., "The Insulated Americans: Five Lessons From Abroad," *Change* (November, 1978), 24-30.

28. Commission On Colleges, *Standards of the College Delegate Assembly* (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, December, 1977), p. 4.

29. Millett, John D., *Strengthening Community In Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: Management Division, Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1974), p. 3.

30. Collins, Charles C., *Blueprint For A Cluster College* (Los Angeles, California: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, University of California, April, 1975), p. 1.

31. The Professional Institute of AMA, *American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Presidents Management Seminar* (Dallas, Texas: October, 1974).

32. Sibson, Robert E., *Increasing Employee Productivity* (New York: AMACOM, 1976), p. 134.

33. Guth, William D., "Behavior And Decision-Making In Complex Organizations," *The Management of Change*, Michael Brick and Andrew A. Bushko, Editors (New York: Community College Center, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973), pps. 21-22.

34. Lombardi, John, *Noncampus Colleges: New Governance Patterns For Outreach Programs* (Los Angeles, California: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, University of California, March, 1977).

35. *Ibid.*, p. 19.

36. *Ibid.*, pps. 24-25.

37. Collins, *op. cit.*

38. *Ibid.*, p. 26.

39. King, Maxwell C. and Robert L. Breuder, *President-Trustee Relationships: Meeting the Challenge of Leadership* (Washington, D.C.: Presidents Academy, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977), p. 12.

40. Bushnell, David S. and Ivars Zagaris, *Report From Project Focus: Strategies For Change* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1972), p. 156.

41. Garbarino, Joseph W. in association with Bill Aussieker, *Faculty Bargaining, Change And Conflict* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Prepared for The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and The Ford Foundation, 1975), pps. 6-11.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

44. Higher Education Management Institute, Management Development and Training Program for Colleges and Universities, Progress Report #2 (Coconut Grove, Florida: HEMI, October, 1976), p. 8.

45. Ibid., p. 39.

46. Ibid., p. 40.

47. Ibid., pps. 40-42.

48. Ibid., p. 44.

49. ACCTion, "Presidents identify management style...," ACCTion Quarterly Review, Vol. 4 No. 2, (December, 1978).

50. Sibson, Robert E., op. cit., pps. 132-133.

51. Ibid., p. 140.

52. McGregor, Douglas, in John R. Sargent, What An Executive Should Know About Leadership (Chicago, Ill.: The Dartnell Corporation, 1975), p. 13.

53. Hall, Jay, "To Achieve or Not: The Manager's Choice," California Management Review Vol XVIII, No. 4 (Summer, 1976), 5-18.

54. Hodgkinson, Harold, in Goodwin, Gregory, and Young, James C., Increasing Productivity In The Community College, (Los Angeles, California: League for Innovation in the Community College and ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, July, 1978), p. 5.

55. Pray, Francis C., A New Look at Community College Boards of Trustees and Presidents and Their Relationships (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975), p. 20.

56. Cohen, Arthur M. and John E. Roueche, Institutional Administrator Or Educational Leader? (Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information and American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), p. 8.

57. Bennis, Warren, "Organizing For Accountability," Speech Presented to the General Session of the CUPA National Convention, Houston, Texas, October, 1974.

STATE OF THE ART: ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESSES

> Leading in the traditional sense perhaps means planning what the job is; imposing rules, regulations, and training to accomplish it; and overseeing control and discipline to assure the desired outcome. Creative goal-oriented leadership may embody many of the same processes but emphasizes the participation and motivation of people by involving them in the processes of planning, controlling, appraising, and conflict resolution.(1)

Lahti was discussing the involvement of people in the important processes which must be in place if a community college is going to move toward "desired ends." Stress has already been placed on the fact that the needs of the community must be known, the mission of the institution must be clear and accepted, the organizational structure should be related to the mission, and institutional leaders should be concerned about the impact of their behavior on the organizational climate. The focus now should be on how to make plans and initiate action to see that events conform to those plans.

PLANNING

The primary prerequisite to planning, definition of mission or purpose, has been discussed, but its importance must be stressed. As Kieft, Armijo and Bucklew (2) indicate: "The lack of such a statement could seriously jeopardize the success of planning." They see the mission statement serving as a guide for policies and programs developed in the planning process. Their handbook, developed in concert with college and universities, is designed to assist institutions with an interest in developing a comprehensive, program-based, and long-range planning process. This NCHEMS work followed publication of four case studies (3). The following conclusions, based on the NCHEMS work (4), form the basis for a planning process.

1. Planning cannot be separated from the mainstream of institutional decision-making.
2. Planning is a future-oriented activity.
3. Planning must not be limited to quantifiable or measurable consideration.
4. A planning process should rationalize decision making by minimizing its ad hoc character.
5. Strict schedules and calendars for planning activities are necessary.
6. Effective planning must be appropriately supported with staff expertise.
7. Planning requires information about internal aspects of the institution.
8. Planning requires information external to the institution as well.
9. The importance of planning...is symbolized by the visible commitment of the institution's chief executive officer...
10. As a planning process becomes operational, it will become more mechanistic.
11. Any planning process that seeks to establish priorities requires considerable time and energy from all participants.

Suggestions offered on how to develop a planning process include assessment of the need and desire for planning within the institution and the creation of planning assumptions. Important advice is also offered relative to productivity.

Efficiency and effectiveness, concepts discussed earlier, must be taken into account in structuring a planning process. The process "must avoid two common errors."

> The first, often found in processes that stress economy, is the propensity to assess productivity only in terms of costs. Here the underlying assumption is that any reduction in cost is to be applauded as an improvement in productivity, regardless of its impact on the institution's effectiveness. The second, usually made by academics and the academy-minded, is a propensity to assess productivity only in terms of outcomes. Here the

> underlying assumption is that any improvement in outcomes, however costly, is desirable. Both outlooks are faulty, because they ignore the fact that productivity is a relationship between two variables, costs and outcomes.(5)

The document also describes the implementation and operation of a planning cycle over a three-year period.

Following publication of the NCHEMS documents, "Executive Briefings" (6) were scheduled for community college personnel in several states (e.g., Washington, Oregon and Virginia) and associations (e.g., AACJC). The briefing included a review of some of the best documents developed to date and provided practical advice on how to develop a planning system in a community college. The work of Satish Parekh (7), the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) (8), and the Resource Center for Planned Change (9) were included in the review. It should also be noted that many community colleges, including the Dallas County Community College District, reviewed the early drafts of the NACUBO publication.

Almost every professional association meeting during 1978-79 included planning as a program topic. An example is the program developed by COMBASE (A Cooperative for the Advancement of Community-Based Postsecondary Education), The University of Michigan Extension Service, and Washtenaw (Michigan) Community College. Their conference, held in March, 1979, was "Community Colleges at the Crossroads: Planning for the Next Decade." Topics included:

The Next Decade: Analysis of Social and Economic Trends
Community College Mission for the 1980's
Community College Planning Models
Policy Choices for the 1980's
A National Study on Community College Futuring

Again, those topics might have been taken from any one of a dozen or more meetings held during 1978-79. It is safe to say that community college leaders are recognizing the vital role of planning in the management of their institutions.

It is important for the community college manager to see how the various functions of management are expressed in planning activities. In addition to planning, one of the defined functions, direction, coordination and controlling are important. In developing, reviewing and approving plans, a manager is involved in directing the work of the institution. In resolving conflicts between competing interests and in causing units to collaborate, a manager is involved in coordination. In creating plans, a manager is creating something against which to make a later measurement and, therefore, is involved in controlling activities. He is also involved in moving an institution toward "desired ends."

RESOURCE ALLOCATION/BUDGETING

> In recent years, we have come to realize that the only way to effectively allocate resources is to handle the planning before that final budgeting process occurs.(10)

Harvey also notes that "it is only after a thorough, detailed planning process has been completed that resources can be allocated effectively." In other words, just as the development of a clear mission is a prerequisite for the planning process, planning should be a prerequisite for the allocation of resources.

Community colleges have certainly not been immune from the fiscal constraints being imposed on institutions of higher education. Millett (11) observes:

> Beginning about 1970 there occurred the "new depression" in higher education. Financial difficulties have continued

> throughout the 1970's, and there is the reasonable prospect that financial pressures will continue into the 1980's, and perhaps beyond.

He also makes the important point: "All purposes and all program or output objectives must continually be reviewed and reformulated in terms of available income." Income, one side of the equation, will be addressed in the section, "Resource Development." Suffice it to say at this point that almost all community colleges are struggling to bring expenditures within the limits of available income. Millett (12) sharpens the focus:

> Essentially there are two approaches to determining the budget requirements of an enterprise. One approach is to examine needs, needs in terms of some desirable state of output and in terms of some desirable rate of expenditure for the production inputs of facilities, personal services, supplies and equipment, and other costs. The second approach is to determine available income, and to plan both output and costs in terms of fitting programs to anticipated revenues. To some extent all enterprises undertake both approaches to their expenditure budgeting.

Millett (13) then describes five well known practices in budgeting. They are:

1. Incremental budgeting - This process begins with the current pattern of expenditures and makes needed additions to the level of outlay.
2. Program budgeting - This process conceives of budgeting as a part of long-range planning. Expenditure requirements are expressed in terms related to specific program objectives.
3. Zero-Based budgeting - This process demands a complete justification of the entire budget request.
4. Income-Expense budgeting - This process demands that expenditures are completely controlled by available income.
5. Executive Decision budgeting - Budget decisions in this process

are made by decree of the responsible administrators and the governing board.

No matter which approach is taken, the budgets should be determined by the educational program, the need for support services, and the limits of available resources.

Harvey (14), in his publication prepared for AIDP institutions, discusses the advantages and disadvantages of Zero-Base budgeting. This process, clearly linked to program budgeting (PPBS), has the following potential advantages:

Produces Annual Program and Expenditure Review
Tradition Cannot Justify Budget
Can Save Money
Develops Cost-Conscious Staff
Better Staff Morale
Reduces Empire Building
Easier to Add New Approaches
More Effective Remediation of Staff Weaknesses
Clearer Relation of Budget to Institutional Objectives
Better Top Management Decisions

Among the potential disadvantages are:

Increased Paperwork
Increased Staff Time
Difficulty in Developing and Ranking
Decision Units and Packages
Little Motivation for Staff

Harvey (15) indicates: "ZBB is likely to be a buzz word in the years to come, as was the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS) and Management by Objectives (MBO) before it." For interested institutions, he does do a good job of describing how to implement a Zero-Base process.

The imperative, as indicated by the American Council on Education (ACE) (16), is as follows:

> The annual budget should be coordinated with the long-range academic and financial plans. It, however, is specific and detailed and presents the plan to finance

> the approved academic program and supporting services for a fiscal year. The annual budget is determined largely by the academic program, but it must be formulated within the limits of the resources available.

ACE also recognized the vital role to be played by faculty and staff members, division or department leaders, and institutional leaders. Further, a suggested flow of activity is helpful in structuring a process. ACE (17) concludes:

> The budget consists of a series of estimates, many of which are prepared months in advance...Since conditions change...there should be continuous review of the data on which the budget estimates were based. Periodic revisions should be made in order that the budget may always represent an up-to-date estimate of realizable revenues and a realistic plan for expenditures.

Vladeck (18) introduced an important note of caution that community college leaders would be wise to consider. He said:

> ...one central element in the economics of higher education is still poorly understood...That element is the role of capital investment -- of physical plant, of bricks and mortar -- as a source of financial strain on educational institutions.

He highlights the problem:

> ...institutions in severe financial straits continue to build in the illusory belief that, since the sources of capital funding appear to be independent of operating funds, the impact of capital investments on operations will only be beneficial.

He goes on to discuss the "uncontrollable" expenses for plant operation and maintenance, and stresses that with energy costs soaring the expenses can only increase. Community college managers, struggling to match operating income and expenditures, will do well to watch for such hidden long-range costs. The admonition pushes the wise manager to consider long-range expenditure planning.

Millett (19) views expenditure planning as a technique of leadership.

> Expenditure planning and income planning, along with policy planning, are the vital tools of management, leadership, and governance within colleges and universities. These tools are indispensable as colleges and universities confront the uncertainties of the 1980's and the 1990's.

If one doubts Millett, he should consult any California community college president who is presently involved in resource development.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

> All too often educational institutions attempt to jump headfirst into a program to secure extra-institutional funds without first considering the basic implications of their actions or the potential consequences of such endeavors. (20)

Young reminded community college managers of the importance of mission or "desired ends" in the pursuit of funding. He called for "proactive resource development" in which assessment of institutional and client needs and anticipated outside funds are related to regular budget resources and the total program of the institution.

One does not need to look for long to discover why "resource development" is suddenly a popular topic for discussion. The passage of Proposition 13 (California) served notice on all of higher education, but the pressures had been building for several years. Rushing (21) discussed building financial constraints and suggested that the problems must be met by imaginative long-range planning. He saw planning as critical, without regard for the approach taken to solve the problems. Locating additional revenues ("resource development"), reduced costs ("efficiency"), and a combination of the two were the areas mentioned for exploration. California community college leaders have, since Proposition 13, been heavily involved in the search.

Lombardi (22) provided a thorough review of community college financing in the "post-proposition 13 era." He discussed tax revenues, state subventions, and tuition as the principal sources of community college revenue. He also pointed out that federal aid represents only 6-10 percent of operating budgets. He viewed private sources, interest income, and profits from auxiliary enterprises as having minor significance. In states without tuition (e.g., California) or local taxes (e.g., West Virginia), the problems are compounded. State funding obviously takes on special significance under either circumstance. With enrollments stabilizing or declining, the pressure to get involved in resource development will increase, because the state formulas are based on or related to student enrollment. Full-time student equivalents, contact hours of instruction, or student credit hours usually "drive" the formulas.

Potential for increasing revenue from the primary sources is bleak according to Lombardi. He cites 20 failures to increase local tax levies in Illinois since 1968. During the same period only six were approved. He also gives evidence to indicate that legislators and governors have been placing limits on resources to be allocated. Restrictions placed on funding for noncredit courses, a growing reluctance to further increase tuition (or to charge tuition in California) and fees, and questions about the impact of the financial crisis on the "open door" are reviewed by Lombardi before he concludes: ...the lean years for community colleges may extend into the 1980's.

AACJC has been active for several years in helping member institutions cope with the changing reality. Through sponsorship of workshops, seminars, and internships, community colleges have been led to pursue more actively the potential for federal funding. As Lombardi indicated, however, only 6-10 percent of operating income is from the federal source. This area will likely become a priority for institutions moving into a planning process for resource development. AIDP funding, reviewed earlier, is an outstanding example of community colleges moving to tap the federal source. Many, however, question the potential loss of local control which could go with an increasing federal role.

Will community colleges be able to attract new students to enhance the funding from state sources? Lombardi offers little hope:

> The unpromising forecasts on population and enrollment are discouraging growth because there is a close relationshop between such growth and revenue. For the last ten years the drop in the enrollment of full-time college-age youth has been balanced by the enrollment of new students -- minorities, veterans, middle-aged women, senior citizens, part-timers, the handicapped, and the institutionalized. But, this flow seems to have reached its peak.

If one accepts that analysis, then bringing about changes in state formula funding approaches may be the only hope. Wattenbarger and Starnes (23) have classified the state patterns as follows:

1. Negotiated Budget - The college negotiates with a state board or the legislature. (12 states)
2. Unit Rate Formula - The revenue is based on a unit like student credit hours. (15 states)
3. Minimum Foundation - Funding is based on the ability of a college to support a minimum foundation with a property tax. (8 states)
4. Cost-Based Program - Funding is based on the costs of instruction by category (e.g., technical education). (15 states)

It is safe to say that community college leaders will scrutinize their respective patterns for the purpose of enhancing the situation.

The thrust for "resource development" is also likely to lead toward increased efforts to attract private funding. Solicitation of foundations and the creation of foundations is an avenue with potential. The creation of a foundation is for a specific purpose. As the Charter and Agreement of Incorporation of the Parkersburg Community College Foundation, Inc. states:

> The objects for which this corporation is formed are as follows:
>
> To promote, encourage and assist in the development and growth of the Parkersburg Community College and to render service to and assistance to the College, its faculty, students and alumnae and to the citizens of the State of West Virginia...

The opportunity to involve the local community, particularly where there is no local tax levy, offers great promise for the future. Provisions for scholarships, special projects, and capital projects will allow community colleges to fill the gaps often left by state funding patterns. It is predictable that community colleges will also increase their activity in the solicitation of grants from existing foundations. In fact, this area may be the greatest untapped resource.

One of the commitments made by colleges which have been successful on the "resource development front" (e.g., Santa Fe, Florida) is the dedication of personnel to lead the effort. The old adage, "you have to spend money to make money," is probably very true when resource development is the topic. It is important for colleges to view the expenditures as investments with the potential for a big "pay-off." As Young indicated, the effort needs to be proactive, and that is not likely to happen in the absence of someone who is devoting primary effort to the task.

Another thrust with promise, in addition to the quest for productivity within current resources, is the new interest in marketing or student recruitment. In the face of funding formulas driven by student numbers, community colleges are bound to expend efforts in the area of expanding enrollment.

MARKETING

Rather than get caught up entirely in discussions of retrenchment, community college leaders might begin to plan for student recruitment. As Leach (24) indicates:

> The discipline of marketing, applied to higher education, offers a positive alternative which has the potential for increasing enrollments, reducing attrition, and making college services more responsive to the needs of consumers (constituencies?).

He described the creation of a task force at Prince George's Community College (Maryland) which led an effort to apply marketing principles for the purpose of increasing enrollment. The group must have been successful since in face of a 2 percent increase nationally in 1977, Prince George's experienced an increase of 15 percent in headcount enrollment. They focused on how to provide students with adequate information (promotion), how to invest resources to prevent students from dropping out (delivery), and how to assess outcomes (evaluation).

A review of ads for conferences and services in a single edition of The Chronicle (25) reveals the heightened interest in the topic. Included were:

Student Retention
Coping With Decline
Marketing Education Programs by Direct Mail
Recruit Foreign Students

Marketing The College And University
Refers Qualified Foreign Students
AACJC Older Americans Program
Does Your School Have Its Share of Foreign Students?

These topics were representative of the program topics for numerous conferences, seminars, and workshops held during 1978-79. In addition, many colleges activated committees to plan marketing efforts.

A task force at Parkersburg Community College recommended a program including the following:

1. Evaluation of current programs and services,
2. Promotion of teamwork within the institution,
3. Review of approaches to publicity,
4. Development of problem-solving approaches to deal with transportation and housing,
5. Creation of a campus information center,
6. Development of an expanded community needs assessment process,
7. Creation of a formal orientation program for new staff members,
8. Development of an extensive student follow-up program,
9. Review of all publications,
10. Development of a goal-oriented advising system,
11. Scheduling of an open house activity,
12. Creation of a specific recruitment program.

The above-mentioned activities, if related to the institutional mission and goals, will enable the staff to be involved in a major renewal activity. All of the activities will be fruitless, however, if the institution is not offering and developing programs to meet specific needs.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

> The development of need is a matter of perception. When an existing college is experiencing difficulties, the realization of need may be immediate; otherwise it may not occur until there has been extensive self-study or external examination, or it may never occur. But colleges that continually fail to recognize needs are likely candidates for extinction. (26)

Levine went on to point out that administrators are becoming increasingly involved in educational policy making, to include program development. Financial constraints are cited as the reason for the increased level of involvement. He also indicates the importance of recognizing the appropriate form of administration to follow within different campus environments.

> Antagonistic, neutral, and supportive environments require different types of administrative arrangements, different types of leadership, different modes of implementing change, and different types of change. (27)

Imposition, with a "protective cushion," led by top administrators or powerful faculty is seen as the only way new programs can be introduced in an antagonistic environment. A coalition of campus opinion leaders is viewed as being able to effect change in a neutral environment. The operating leaders (e.g., chairmen and deans), with consensus on campus, will be able to implement new programs within a supportive environment. Community college leaders would certainly do well to assess the campus environment within which they plan to introduce new program ideas. They must also be certain that a "real" need exists in the service area.

Kieft (28) includes the approach taken in Kansas City (Metropolitan Community College District) in which steps taken in a feasibility study are described. Included are the following activities:

Appointment of Temporary Advisory Committee
Job Market Analysis
Survey of Existing Programs to Establish Geographic Need
Determination of Acceptability for Transfer
Determination of Degree of Student Interest
Determination of Availability of Facilities

If results of the feasibility study are positive, then additional steps include:

Selection of Permanent Advisory Committee
Curriculum Development and Review
Budget Development
Facility Requirements Specified
Approval Procedures

Appropriate roles for community representatives, university representatives, and college faculty and administrators are also described. The process described is specific to the program thrust being explored, but it can also be viewed as a part of ongoing community needs assessment. Given proper needs assessment and appropriate program development, the focus now should be on committed, satisfied faculty and staff members who are called upon to implement programs.

PERSONNEL SYSTEMS

The minimum expectation for a personnel system would be to avoid trouble and employee discontent. Developing a system that contributes to the success of the institution would, however, be the goal for an institution concerned about educational productivity. The American Council on Education (ACE)(29) addressed the goal in describing a systematic approach to personnel administration. They call for a personnel department responsible for the following activities:

1. Recruiting and screening applicants - The important element of "compliance" is included.
2. Establishing training and supervisory programs - Elements included

are orientation, supervision, and staff development.

3. Establishing a classification system - The basis for the system would be position descriptions.
4. Developing salary and wage plans - Performance and length of service are considered along with salary and wage ranges.
5. Establishing and administering policies governing relationships between the institution and its staff members - The matter of morale is discussed.
6. Maintaining complete personnel records - This function is related to the program of staff benefits as well as to statistical reporting.
7. Administering the program of staff benefits - Included are administrators, faculty, and service personnel.

With the emphasis in the 1970's on compliance, equal opportunity, affirmative action, equal pay for equal work, and unionization, it is difficult to understand how any college could avoid confronting the matter of personnel administration.

Sibson (30) suggests three levels of achievement with respect to compensation:

> ...solving the pay problems of the enterprise, making a strategic contribution to the achievement of enterprise goals, and contributing to the development of the organization.

He is really talking about whether there are incentives present that encourage staff members to develop themselves in ways to benefit the organization.

The type of approach encouraged by Sibson, and the type being developed in some community colleges (e.g., Dallas County Community College District and Parkersburg Community College) would include:

1. Creation of position descriptions based on a position analysis.
2. Development of a position evaluation process which is likely to include a point evaluation system.
3. Establishment of a process to group positions in grades on the basis of total points yielded in the position evaluation process.
4. Creation of a process to "price" the relative value of positions classified according to grade.
5. Establishment of salary or wage ranges (minimum to maximum) for each grade in the system.
6. Developing an approach to "pricing" the structure in relationship to the market (e.g., local community or higher education in the region).
7. Creation of a policy for salary administration to cover individual pay actions.
8. Defining the relationship of performance-appraisal to individual pay actions.

Productive work in the realm of personnel administration is a prerequisite to the type of employee commitment discussed here, and the above-mentioned approaches are being explored by an increasing number of community colleges. The "jury" is still out, however, regarding whether the approach, developed in the private sector, will pay the dividends expected by those who are implementing the systems. All community college leaders would do well to consider the caution issued by Lahti (31):

> An equitable salary program depends on valid job classifications, periodic salary review of competitive levels, performance appraisals, and effective salary planning. The lack of these interrelated and essential primary

> elements frequently leaves the two-year college with numerous unresolved wage and salary problems.

A college with many unresolved problems is going to have difficulty in achieving educational productivity, since faculty and staff members are included in the constituencies to be satisfied. They also need to be satisfied with the level of support they receive on a day-to-day basis. The management information system, as it is commonly named, must also be working to contribute to efficiency and effectiveness.

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Computer technology has led to a "revolution" on community college campuses when it comes to how information is processed and stored. Among the many functions dependent on computer processes, one is likely to find

1. Registration
2. Financial Aid Programs
3. Accounting
4. Student Records
5. Budgeting and Budget Reports
6. Inventory
7. Book Processing and Circulation
8. Institutional Research
9. Governmental Reporting
10. Personnel Systems
11. Payroll
12. Student Assessment
13. Computer Managed and Assisted Instruction

The list could go on, but the point is that many employees are dependent on an information system and computer technology in order to be efficient and effective in their daily work.

The potential value of these systems is obvious because of the capacity to accumulate, store, analyze and recall data upon request.

> These three capabilities in turn call for: (1) computer equipment...adequate to receive and store the range and variety of data...; (2) personnel competent to select the information to be stored; and (3) a skillful director of the system who can specify the forms in which input and output are most useful to administrators. (32)

ACE also makes the point that because of the complexity of the data to be handled, it is important to "design each portion of the system so that it is integrated effectively with each other part." The integration mentioned leads to the creation of a true information system. The development of the "data bank" or "data base" should be based on desired outcomes. The desired outcomes, developed with an institution-wide perspective, should be clearly stated, and they should form the basis for planning the system. It will also be necessary for the institution to establish a mechanism through which priorities are established. The pressures or competing interests make it difficult for a computer services director to allocate staff and computer time. Many institutions have, in fact, created a user committee to review requests for program development. Through careful development and integration an institution can increase both efficiency and effectiveness. On the other hand, if the system is ill-conceived then the potential for constant disruption is present.

As ACE (33) says:

> The improved accessibility, timeliness, and quality of data on which to base decisions and action serve the purpose of helping administrators achieve the institution's educational objectives.

It certainly is important for top administrators to be aware of the potential of their systems. Brady and others (34) provided a helpful non-technical discussion on the development and use of computing in an educational institution. They talk about the roles and responsibilities of users and focus on the key role of upper-level administrators. Another publication by Mann and others (35) describes current uses of computers and the allocation of computer resources. A review of "state-of-the-art" documents is a "must" for the college manager who wants to be certain that his system is both effective (achieving desired ends) and efficient (within tolerable costs). Attendance at "executive briefings" offered by commercial vendors and professional associations can also help remove the "mystery" surrounding computers. The ultimate test is whether the system is a useful tool in the management of the institution, and only an informed manager can approach making that determination.

EVALUATION

> One major difficulty is that, traditionally, few explicit measures of program effectiveness have been collected. Also, little has been done to show the links between resources and activities used and the attainment of desired outcomes, even when these outcomes can be quantified. In short, it has been much easier to see whether a plan has been accomplished in terms of activity or resource measures (e.g., expenditures, student/faculty ratios, enrollment levels) than in terms of educational outcomes. (36)

Micek is on target in assessing the state-of-the-art in measuring the outcomes of community college education. He cites additional problems in identifying and measuring outcomes and incorporating this information in planning:

> ...even when information...is available, it is difficult to use since the techniques for analyzing and interpreting... are limited or are not well understood.

> ...most planners and decision-makers simply have a hard time translating their institutional and program goals into specific objectives stated in measurable outcome terms.
>
> ...use of outcome data is often thwarted by the fear of potential misuses.

Micek also discusses the early NCHEMS work in developing institutional and program cost information as only a part of what is needed to respond to the press for accountability. The conceptual stage of the next major effort, which became the Outcomes Project at NCHEMS, is then reviewed. Micek (38) indicates that three related needs must be filled:

1. The need to provide a comprehensive picture of the outcomes of postsecondary education and to develop the capability to measure these outcomes;
2. The need to provide a structure for organizing outcomes information as a prerequisite for the analysis and communication of this information; and
3. The need to develop analytic procedures to apply this information to the solution of particular planning and management problems.

Additional NCHEMS publications (38, 39, 40, 41, 42) describe the evolution of this important work. The structure includes the following "audience" dimension components:

Direct Clients (e.g., students)

Interest-Based Communities (e.g., private enterprise)

Geographic-Based Communities (e.g., cities)

Aggregates of People (e.g., age groups)

The "Type-of-Outcome" dimension components are:

Economic (e.g., income, security)

Human Characteristic (e.g., competence, skill, coping)

Knowledge, Technology, and Art Form (e.g., individual mastery)

Resource and Service (e.g., facilities, events)

Other (e.g., change in cultural level)

The "Time" dimension focuses on when the outcome is expected to occur. No formal categories have been developed for the dimension because they would be difficult to apply across the audience categories. Armijo and others (43) included an example which described a taxonomy for the dimension. The "Time" dimension along with the "audience" and "Type-of-Outcome" dimensions provides a structure within which educators can work to answer questions about the outcomes of community college education.

Roueche and others (44) asked: "What can the student do after instruction (completing a course or program) that he could not do before?" They continued: "The accountability concept makes it possible for all members of the community to see what 'results' are being produced with its tax dollars." Hartnett (45) adds to the thought:

> Almost all proponents of educational accountability tend to favor a "value-added" concept. That is, institutions should be judged not by their outputs alone, but by their outputs relative to their inputs. ..."What has the student attained in relation to his capability at the starting point?"

Hartnett then described numerous problems in approaching the task of measuring the "value-added" dimension. He concluded:

> These problems suggest that evaluating differential college impact may not be possible at all or, at best, that it will be some time before it can be done very well. The real difficulty is not so much in developing new, reliable, relevant criterion measures. That will be difficult, of course, but certainly no insurmountable task. The problem will be in demonstrating differential college effects on these various criteria. (46)

The development of the criteria can be found in the NCHEMS work, but no major breakthroughs have been made on the "value-added" front. Micek (47) would agree with Hartnett that it is difficult to develop the criteria, but he also cites the complexity:

> For example, given all of the variables that potentially affect a particular outcome, it is extremely difficult to determine cause-and-effect relationships. A further complexity results because many programs have joint outcomes. For example, a vocational-technical program may contribute to student knowledge and skill development in addition to producing various services to members of the business community.

Harvey (48) gets more specific in talking about outcomes:

> If an institution has an effective planning system, and if they are planning in terms of the definition above (quantifiable measurement of results), then they are setting institutional objectives. These objectives stem from broader, usually non-quantifiable, institutional goals. ...These institutional objectives and the measures they contain form the basis for outcome measures and for an outcome measurement system for an institution.

Hartnett (49) adds an important caution:

> Behavioral objectives, highly esteemed among educational evaluators for many years, have some serious shortcomings of their own, however. Not least among them stems from their specificity... Because they are highly specific, behavioral objectives permit precise measurement. On the other hand, this small precision can be restrictive, in that other highly desirable educational outcomes are omitted.

It is safe to say that educators are still in the process of determining how to measure educational effectiveness. Important work is being done, primarily at NCHEMS, and community college administrators need to be "out front" in the quest to measure whether the needs of their constituencies have been met.

In the meantime, community colleges in all states are involved in the search. Examples include:

Graduate Follow-up Studies

Attrition Studies

Community-Impact Studies

Technical Program Follow-up Studies

Employer Surveys

Information gained in these studies will supply valuable assistance for efforts in planning and evaluation.

REFERENCES

1. Lahti, Robert E., Innovative College Management (San Francisco, Washington, London: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973), p. 18.

2. Kieft, Raymond, Frank Armijo, and Neil S. Bucklew, A Handbook for Institutional Academic and Program Planning: From Idea to Implementation (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978), p. 7.

3. Kieft, Raymond N., Academic Planning: Four Institutional Case Studies (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978).

4. Kieft and others, op. cit., pps. 4-7.

5. Ibid., p. 13.

6. Armijo, Frank and Byron N. McClenney, Leaders, "Executive Briefing", (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978-79).

7. Parekh, Satish B., Long-Range Planning: An Institution-Wide Approach to Increasing Academic Vitality (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1977).

8. National Association of College and University Business Officers, A College Planning Cycle: People Resources Process (Washington, D.C.: NACUBO, 1975).

9. Resource Center for Planned Change, A Futures Creating Paradigm: A Guide to Long-Range Planning from the Future for the Future (Washington, D.C.: American Association for State Colleges and Universities, 1978).

10. Harvey, L. James, Zero-Base Budgeting (Washington, D.C.: Report prepared by McManis Associates, Inc. supported by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Vol. III No. 3), p. 1-3.

11. Millett, John D., Editor, Planning in Higher Education, A Manual For Colleges and Universities (Washington, D.C.: Academy For Educational Development, Inc., July, 1977), p. 411.

12. Ibid., p. 447.

13. Ibid., pps. 448-491.

14. Harvey, op. cit., pps. II-1, II-2, II-3.

15. Ibid., VII-4.

16. American Council On Education, George E. Van Dyke, Editor, *College and University Business Administration*, (Washington, D.C.: ACE, 1968), p. 156.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 164.

18. Vladeck, Bruce C., "Buildings and Budgets: The Overinvestment Crisis," *Change* (December-January, 1978-79), 36-40.

19. Millett, *op. cit.*, p. 491.

20. Young, James H., "Shotgunning For $," *Community and Junior College Journal* (November, 1978), 42-44.

21. Rushing, Joe B., *Changing Role Of The Community College President In The Face Of New Administrative Pressures* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976).

22. Lombardi, John, "Community College Financing In The Post-Proposition 13 Era," *ERIC Junior College Resource Review* (January, 1979).

23. Wattenbarger, James L. and Paul M. Starnes, *Financial Support Patterns for Community Colleges* (Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida, Institute of Higher Education, 1976).

24. Leach, Ernest R.,"Implementing the Marketing Process," *Community and Junior College Journal* (December/January, 1977-78), 20-24.

25. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* Volume XVII, Number 18 (January 15, 1979).

26. Levine, Arthur, *Handbook On Undergraduate Curriculum* (San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1978), p. 422.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 437.

28. Kieft, *op. cit.*, pps. 134-137.

29. ACE, *op. cit.*, pps. 82-94.

30. Sibson, Robert E., *Compensation* (New York: AMACOM, 1974), p. 2.

31. Lahti, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

32. ACE, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

34. Brady, Ronald W., John F. Chaney, George W. Baughman, and Robert A. Wallhaus, *Administrative Data Processing: The Case for Executive Management Involvement* (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1975).

35. Mann, Richard L., Charles R. Thomas, Richard C. Williams, and Robert A. Wallhaus, *An Overview of Two Recent Studies of Administrative Computer Operations in Higher Education* (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1975).

36. Micek, Sidney S., "An Approach To Outcome Measures Definition, Collection, and Use," *Outcome Measurements in Higher Education*, L. James Harvey, Contributing Editor (Washington, D.C.: McManis Associates, Inc. for the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Vol. 1, No. 3), p. 3.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

38. Micek, Sidney S. and William Ray Arney, *Outcome-Oriented Planning in Higher Education: An Approach or An Impossibility?* (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1973).

39. Lenning, Oscar T., *Previous Attempts to Structure Educational Outcomes and Outcome Related Concepts: A Compilation and Review of the Literature* (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977).

40. Lenning, Oscar T., *The Outcomes Structure: An Overview and Procedures For Applying it in Postsecondary-Education Institutions* (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977).

41. Lenning, Oscar T., Yong S. Lee, Sidney S. Micek, and Allan L. Service, *A Structure for the Outcomes of Postsecondary Education* (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977.

42. Bower, Cathleen and Nancy Renkiewicz, *A Handbook for Using the Student Outcomes Questionnaires* (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977).

43. Armijo, J. Frank, Sidney S. Micek, and Edward M. Cooper, *Conducting Community-Impact Studies: A Handbook for Community Colleges* (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978), p. 246.

44. Roueche, John E., George A. Baker III, and Richard Brownell, *Accountability and the Community College, Directions for the 70's* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971), p. 38.

45. Hartnett, Rodney T., *Accountability in Higher Education* (Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971), p. 15.

46. *Ibid.*, p. 20.

47. Micek, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

48. Harvey, L. James, "PME and Outcome Measures," Outcome Measurements in Higher Education, L. James Harvey, Contributing Editor (Washington, D.C.: McManis Associates, Inc., for the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Vol. 1, No. 3), p. 18.

49. Hartnett, op. cit., pps. 12-13.

MANAGEMENT FOR PRODUCTIVITY

> A leader is one who moves the group toward its goals. The quality of leadership does not necessarily relate to the leaders being liked or feared by group members. The essential is that there be effect. Without group movement toward defined ends, there has been, by definition, no leadership. (1)

Cohen and Roueche place in perspective the role of the community college manager who is concerned about educational productivity. Movement toward goals, achieving desired ends or outcomes, accomplishment of purpose or mission, and producing abundant results are among the various ways of describing the quest for productivity in management. The fact that it is difficult to measure educational effectiveness should not deter concerned administrators from seeking such measures. In addition, the fact that it is easier to measure efficiency through the use of quantifiable measures should not lead to reliance on these measures as true measures of productivity. Rather, it should be recognized that the "effects" sought by educators are both quantitative and qualitative.

It is not adequate to say that education is "labor intensive" and, therefore, the only way to increase productivity is to increase the number of students taught by faculty members. As Vladeck (2) says, "...there is thought to be a qualitative cost to such productivity improvements." Vladeck then adds this insight:

> If higher education is inherently labor intensive because it can be provided only through the interaction of skilled professionals and consumers, then, almost by definition, capital must be largely nonproductive. If the exposure of students to a professor's wisdom or guidance is what education is all about, then that exposure can take place in a lean-to or a palace...

The non-campus community colleges referred to earlier are certainly exploring the potential for an increase in educational productivity by avoiding the creation of "palaces." In addition, community colleges are exploring alternative instructional methodologies as an avenue for increasing productivity. These efforts are representative of the growing interest among community college leaders to demonstrate accountability. A review of additional efforts might now be helpful as a springboard to a discussion on the potential of "management for productivity."

THE PRESENT

Berchin (3) conducted an exploratory study in 1972 among colleges in the League For Innovation and found most of the 41 involved in instructional experimentation leading toward development of "productive" courses. He attempted to compare per-pupil costs of conventional and nonconventional courses. Nonconventional approaches included "large group," "individualized/programmed," and "audiotutorial" modes of instruction. A formula to compute per-pupil costs, grades, number of students completing courses, and interviews with instructors were utilized to assess efficiency and effectiveness. He indicated the limitations of the study (4), not the least of which would be the subjectivity of the interviewer and the involved instructors, and then concludes:

> 1. Changing the pattern of classroom organization or the instructional mode can reduce per-pupil costs and increase learning effectiveness.
>
> 2. Courses organized under the large group mode of instruction generally are less costly...than conventionally organized courses.
>
> 3. Courses organized under the individualized programmed mode...are generally less costly...than conventionally organized courses.

> 4. Courses under the audiotutorial mode of instruction are generally more costly...

He described that instructors who have taught both conventional and nonconventional courses perceive the nonconventional ones to be more effective. An important note of caution is, however, listed in the recommendations (5):

> Subjective data indicate that courses using any of the three nonconventional modes should usually be reserved for self-directed learners.

Implicit in the reference to self-directed learners is the idea that educators can identify who they are and that community colleges have approaches in place for advising these students.

Matching learning style with instructional methodology, under the title "Cognitive Style," is one of the efforts to increase productivity described by Goodwin and Young (6). Reference is made to the approaches at Mountain View (Dallas, Texas), Moraine Valley (Illinois), and Central Piedmont (North Carolina), describing numerous efforts to increase productivity. Included in the publication are descriptions of efforts in the following areas:

- Administrative Performance
    - Organizational Models
    - College Governance
    - Professional Development
    - Leadership Style
    - Information Management Systems
    - Academic Calendar
    - Facility Design and Management
- Faculty Performance
    - Differentiated Staffing
    - Staff Development Programs
    - New Forms of Instruction
    - Faculty Assignment Policies
    - Collective Bargaining and Faculty Productivity
    - Gaining Faculty Support

Student Performance

- Grading Systems
- Open-Entry, Open-Exit Systems
- Multimedia Delivery Systems
- Outreach Centers
- Nontraditional Learning

Goodwin and Young (7) conclude:

> We have no words of wisdom to sum up how to increase productivity in community colleges. Most of the models described here are still experimental, and the institutions involved are still engaged in evaluating them. Perhaps the best conclusion is not to conclude...

They do offer some "survival tactics" leading toward productivity. They quote Harold Hodgkinson (8):

1. Develop a clearly focused mission.
2. Create programs that clearly reflect that purpose and collectively add up to it.
3. Limit student diversity to some extent in order to achieve a unified campus community.
4. Establish good cooperative relationships with other institutions.
5. Establish a generally democratic governance structure which permits many people to exercise leadership yet permits effective decision making.
6. Set clear standards of performance.
7. Be cost effective.

The community college leader who adopts the above-mentioned tactics will do more than lead an institution to survive. The institution will be well on the way to achieving productivity.

Perhaps the experience of a college struggling with the concept of productivity will add insight for one seeking to manage for productivity. As was mentioned earlier, Eastfield College and the Dallas County Community

College District (Texas) have been involved since 1974 in an effort to increase productivity. The efforts went through several stages. The first response included a set of questions. Does productivity mean

1. Serving more students with the same number of instructors?
2. Increasing the level of income?
3. Measuring student enrollment and various ratios?
4. Measuring course and program completion?
5. Quantification of services rendered (e.g., students counseled)?
6. Student satisfaction?
7. Excluding qualitative aspects of college work?

Following the questions came a round of efficiency developments which were relatively easy to measure. Examples are

1. Tighter controls on copier machine use.
2. Savings through bulk mailing.
3. Key control procedures.
4. Improvement in inventory control.
5. Employment of a collection agency to collect bad debts.
6. Declaration of surplus property to free storage space.

The next level of development led to examples like the following:

1. Utilization of cost-per-contact-hour data to monitor courses and programs.
2. Initiation of student follow-up studies.
3. Creation of a computer-assisted room utilization program.
4. Development of orientation programs for part-time instructors.
5. Development of a "human resource" catalog to identify "in-house" consultants.

6. Administration of an internal needs assesment.

The next stage led to the overlap of the definitions of management and productivity. A definition of productivity emerged through 43 small group discussions involving 250 faculty and staff members. As described in an earlier publication (9), the definition included:

> Getting the job done with the best quality and least expenditures.
>
> Being able to accomplish up to my potential.
>
> Having a personal sense of being responsible.
>
> Having open lines of communication.
>
> Increasing efficiency and output.

Concerns for quality, efficiency, responsibility, and communication were all addressed. A "cost-consciousness' also emerged which made it easier to create budgets to carry-out plans. Eastfield College and the other Dallas colleges (El Centro, Mountain View, and Richland) demonstrated that community colleges can deal with the concept of productivity, and at the same time strive to manage with greater efficiency and effectiveness. It just might be possible for community colleges to be efficient.

Fedewa (10), in discussing the relative performance of managers in business and higher education, observes:

> Management's job in an on-going enterprise is basically to acquire revenue, and to spend it wisely, with the result that the organization's mission has been advanced.
>
> By these criteria, I would suggest that academic management is second to none in making the best use of existing resources.

He then discussed, from his vantage point as a manager in a major corporation, how many similarities there are in the roles of academic and corporate managers. He concluded:

> Most organizations today are dominated by "groupthink," and the political skills necessary to succeed in either environment are applicable to the other. The jargon and the buzzwords differ somewhat and so do the conventions. But there are more similarities than differences.

If Fedewa is right about the similarities, then community college managers do not need to feel guilty and it is also possible to talk about the future of the search for educational productivity in community colleges.

THE FUTURE

$$\text{Productiveness} = \frac{\text{correctness of action} + \text{measure of output} - \text{disruptive effect}}{\text{total man-hours of work}} \qquad (11)$$

In a labor-intensive, human service agency like a community college, the formula for productiveness has great potential. "Correctness of action" should be assessed by asking whether a proposed action is consistent with the purpose or mission of the institution. "Measures of output" like graduates placed in jobs, student satisfaction with instruction, and number of student majors can be considered as community college leaders become more comfortable with the developing concern for "outcomes" of higher education. Concerns about "disruptive effects" will also cause administrators to take the long-term view rather than focusing on efficiency outcomes with potential short-term impact. Underlying attempts to apply the formula should be attentiveness to the multiple perspectives and level of satisfaction of the various constituencies.

Given the perspective of the above-mentioned formula, a summary of the major elements in management for productivity would appear to be in order. Community colleges are likely to be well managed and productive when the following propositions and conditions are descriptive:

1. Boundaries are established and the needs of the college service area are understood.

2. The mission or purpose is clearly defined and is based on the needs of the college service area.
3. College employees are committed to the mission.
4. An organizational structure has been created to carry-out the mission.
5. The internal process of college governance is clear to all campus constituencies.
6. Logical work groups have been established.
7. There are clearly defined organizational goals.
8. College leaders recognize that their behavior has an effect on organizational climate.
9. College leaders strive to create efficient and effective organizational processes.
10. There is a systematic planning process in place.
11. The college is involved in both income and expenditure planning.
12. The work of the organization will be planned on the basis of the mission and goals.
13. Clear work assignments are made.
14. High standards for performance will be established.
15. Resources will be allocated on the basis of planning.
16. Leaders will coordinate the work of college units to develop collaborative efforts.
17. Participative patterns of leader and group behavior will be developed.
18. Leaders will consider the impact on the organizational environment in selecting appropriate steps to take in

moving the organization toward achievement of purpose.

19. There will be processes in place to ensure that events conform to plans.

20. There will be a "positive regard" between the campus chief executive and the board.

21. Policies and procedures will be clear and available to all employees.

22. There will be regular efforts to determine the extent to which constituencies have been satisfied.

23. There will be information available regarding unit costs.

24. Assessments will be made to relate costs to benefits or outcomes.

25. There will be a recognition that institutional effectiveness is linked to managerial effectiveness.

26. There will be a careful integration of work-centered concerns with people concerns.

27. There are likely to be high levels of job satisfaction.

28. Changes will be introduced with due respect to natural resistance to change and potential disruptive effects.

29. Community advisory committees are heavily involved in developing and evaluating programs.

30. Program development is based on needs assessment in the service area.

31. The college is collecting evidence of student learning.
32. There is information available regarding attrition rates and efforts are being made to reduce attrition.
33. An appropriate marketing strategy is being followed.
34. The college is proactive in resource development.
35. Efforts are being made to cooperate with other community agencies for the purpose of avoiding duplication.
36. Staff development programs are an integral part of ongoing campus activities.
37. A management information system provides appropriate and timely information for decision-making.
38. Personnel systems are viewed as satisfactory by college employees.
39. Management for productivity will be undertaken as a long-range, developmental process.

Community colleges in all parts of the United States are seeking to move in the above-mentioned directions with assistance from a variety of sources.

HEMI, with the management development program, and NCHEMS, with the Outcomes Project, are in the forefront of the movement toward educational productivity. Other groups like COMBASE, ACCTion, AIDP consortia, The League For Innovation In The Community College, NACUBO, Educational Testing Service, College Entrance Examination Board, ACE, American College Testing Program, ACCT (community college trustees), and AED (Academy for Educational Development) are directly involved in helping community colleges become more productive. Finally, but certainly not least among the groups, AACJC continues to provide overall leadership as community colleges prepare for the 1980's.

The enlightened community college leader will be involved in managing his institution to meet the expectations of its constituents. He or she will be concerned about developing commitment among staff members to move the institution toward accomplishment of purpose. Efficiency and effectiveness will be sought and measured, with results shared in such a way as to engender support for the college. In summary, skillful college leaders will use sound judgment in conducting college operations in order for the institution to achieve the purpose for which it was created.

The emphasis on qualitative dimensions in the summary of major elements in management for productivity should not be construed as an effort to downplay quantitative aspects in the quest for productivity. Cost reductions or increased ratios will and should be pursued, but not without examining "correctness of action" as earlier discussed. Numerous "disruptive effects" such as collective bargaining will be encountered by community college managers, but the contention here is that understanding the long-term qualitative elements can help one avoid or soften the impact of potential disruptions. An action taken to increase effeciency in the immediate future, but which is disruptive in the long-term view, could not be described as effective. Managers who avoid collective bargaining or who achieve productive contracts are likely to be individuals who seek the effective long-term outcomes. Similarly, faculty and staff members are more likely to be committed to institutional purposes when managers seek a proper balance between production and human concerns.

There will need to be a search for appropriate incentives to encourage members of campus communities to search for productive new approaches. Bonuses, grants for instructional development, extra travel money, flexible work hours, acquisition of special equipment, special recognition or awards, and released time for continuing education may all have value. The most important incentive, however, may be creation of an environment or climate in which a person can influence decisions and directions within an institution. As people experience meaningful work they become more productive. The focus of this manuscript has been on creation of the proper climate in which productivity can be sought through collaborative efforts of college personnel.

Building a "bridge" from concepts and theories to actual practice will now be the challenge for community college leaders in the 1980's. In an effort to assist with the translation, the final section incorporates case studies drawn from representative community colleges.

REFERENCES

1. Cohen, Arthur M. and John E. Roueche, *Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader?* (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information and American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), p. 8.

2. Vladeck, Bruce C., "Buildings and Budgets: The Overinvestment Crisis," *Change* (December-January, 1978/79), 36-40.

3. Berchin, Arthur, *Toward Increased Efficiency In Community College Courses* (Los Angeles, California: League for Innovation in the Community College, 1972).

4. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

6. Goodwin, Gregory and James C. Young, *Increasing Productivity In The Community College* (Los Angeles, California: League for Innovation in the Community College and ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, July, 1978), pps. 35-36.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 39.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

9. McClenney, Byron N., "The President as Manager," *Community and Junior College Journal* (April, 1978), 26, 31-33.

10. Fedewa, Lawrence J., "How Efficient Are Colleges?," *The Chronicle Of Higher Education* Volume XVII, Number 12 (November 20, 1978), p. 48.

11. Sibson, Robert E., Increasing Employee Productivity (New York: AMACOM, 1976), p. 49.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Entries not cited in the text have been marked (*) for the convenience of the reader.

ACCTion. "Presidents identify management style... " ACCTion Quarterly Review . Vol. 4 No. 2, December, 1978.

ACCTion Consortium. Suite 1500-North Bldg., 955 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Washington, D. C. 20024.

Advisory Council on Developing Institutions. Strengthening Developing Institutions, Title III Of The Higher Education Act Of 1965. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March, 1978.

* The American College Testing Program. COMP College Outcome Measures Project. Annual Report. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1976.

American Council On Education. George E. Van Dyke, Editor. College and University Business Administration. Washington, D.C.: ACE, 1968.

* Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Armijo, Frank,and McClenney, Byron N., Leaders. "Executive Briefing." Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978-79.

Armijo, J. Frank, Micek, Sidney S., and Cooper, Edward M. Conducting Community-Impact Studies: A Handbook for Community Colleges. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978.

Barnard, Chester I. The Functions Of The Executive. Thirtieth Anniversary Edition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

* Bennis, Warren G. Organization Development: Its Nature, Origins, and Prospects. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc., 1969.

Bennis, Warren. "Organizing For Accountability." Speech Presented to the General Session of the CUPA National Convention, Houston, Texas, October, 1974.

Berchin, Arthur. Toward Increased Efficiency In Community College Courses. Los Angeles, California: League for Innovation in the Community College, 1972.

* Blake, Robert R., and Mouton, Janes S. Corporate Excellence Through Grid Organization Development. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1968.

Blocker, Clyde E. "A National Agenda for Community and Junior Colleges." An Agenda for National Action. Report of the 1972 Assembly. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973.

Bower, Cathleen, and Nancy Renkiewicz. A Handbook for Using the Student Outcomes Questionnaires. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977.

Bower, Joseph L. "Effective Public Management." Harvard Business Review, March-April, 1977, 132.

Brady, Ronald W., Chaney, John F., Baughman, George W., and Wallhaus, Robert A. Administrative Data Processing: The Case for Executive Management Involvement. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1975.

* Bushnell, David and Rappaport, Donald. Planned Change In Education: A Systems Approach. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1971.

Bushnell, David S., and Zagaris, Ivars. Report From Project Focus: Strategies For Change. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1972.

* Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The More Effective Use of Resources--An Imperative for Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, June, 1972.

Clark, Burton R. "The Insulated Americans: Five Lessons From Abroad." Change, November, 1978, 24-30.

* Cohen, Arthur M., and Associates. A Constant Variable. New Perspectives On the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Roueche, John E. Institutional Administrator Or Educational Leader? Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information and American Association of Junior Colleges 1969.

Collins, Charles C. Blueprint For A Cluster College. Los Angeles, California: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, University of California, April, 1975.

Commission On Colleges. Standards of the College Delegate Assembly. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, December, 1977.

* Davis, Gordon S. Management Information Systems: Conceptual Foundations, Structure, and Development. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

* Drucker, Peter. Management: Tasks, Responsibilities and Practices. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Drucker, Peter F. "Managing The Public Service Institution". Public Interest, 33, Fall, 1978, 43-60.

Drucker, Peter F. Technology, Management & Society. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970.

* Educational Testing Service. Institutional Goals Inventory. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

* Educational Testing Service. Undergraduate Assessment Program Guide. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

* Evans, N. Dean and Neagley, Ross L. Planning and Developing Innovative Community Colleges. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Fedewa, Lawrence J. "How Efficient Are Colleges?" The Chronicle Of Higher Education, Volume XVII, Number 12, November 20, 1978.

Garbarino, Joseph W. in association with Bill Aussieker. Faculty Bargaining, Change And Conflict. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Prepared for The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and The Ford Foundation, 1975.

* Garms, Walter I. Financing Community Colleges. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1977.

George, Claude S., Jr. The History of Management Thought. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice - Hall, Inc., 1968.

* Gilbert, Fontelle. An ACCT Major Pronouncement: Common Concerns Among Community College Presidents and Trustees. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees, 1976.

* Gollattscheck, James F., Harlacher, Ervin L., Roberts, Eleanor, and Wygal, Benjamin R. College Leadership for Community Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Goodwin, Gregory and Young, James C. Increasing Productivity In The Community College. Los Angeles, California: League for Innovation in the Community College and ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, July, 1978.

Guth, William D. "Behavior And Decision-Making In Complex Organizations." The Management of Change. Brick, Michael, and Bushko, Andrew A., Editors. New York: Community College Center, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973.

Haggerty, Patrick E. Productivity In Education. Dallas, Texas: Texas Instruments Incorporated, 1974.

Hall, Jay. "To Achieve or Not: The Manager's Choice." California Management Review, Vol XVIII, No. 4, Summer, 1976, 5-18.

Hartnett, Rodney T. Accountability in Higher Education. Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971.

Harvey, L. James. "PME and Outcome Measures." Outcome Measurements in Higher Education, L. James Harvey, Contributing Editor. Washington, D. C.: McManis Associates, Inc. for the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Vol. 1, No. 3.

Harvey, L. James. Zero-Base Budgeting. Washington, D.C.: Report prepared by McManis Associates, Inc. supported by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Helath, Education, and Welfare, Vol. III No. 3.

Higher Education Management Institute. "A Seminar for Community College Administrators on the Management Development and Training Program for Colleges and Universities." Program Introduction. Coconut Grove, Florida: HEMI, 1977.

Higher Education Management Institute. Management Development and Training Program for Colleges and Unviersities, Progress Report #2. Coconut Grove, Florida: HEMI, October, 1976.

Institute for Educational Management. "Tenth Annual Management Development Program for College and University Administrators." Harvard University, June-July, 1979.

Johnson, B. Lamar. Starting A Community College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964.

Kieft, Raymond N. Academic Planning: Four Institutional Case Studies. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978.

Kieft, Raymond N., Armijo, Frank, and Bucklew, Neil S. A Handbook for Institutional Academic and Program Planning: From Idea to Implementation. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978.

King, Maxwell D., and Breuder, Robert L. President-Trustee Relationships: Meeting the Challenge of Leadership. Washington, D.C.: Presidents Academy, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977.

* Kintzer, Frederick, Jensen, Arthur M., and Hansen, John S. The Multi-Institution Junior College District. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1975.

* Knoell, Dorothy, and McIntyre, Charles. Planning Colleges for the Community. San Francisco, Ca.: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.

* Knoell, Dorothy, and Others. Through the Open Door; A Study of Patterns of Enrollment and Performance in California's Community Colleges. Report 76-1. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1976.

Lahti, Robert E. Innovative College Management. San Francisco, Washington, London: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Lawrence, Ben. Statewide Planning For Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design. Lyman A. Glenny and George B. Weathersby, Eds. Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE, September, 1971.

Lawrence, G. Ben, and Service, Allan L., Editors. Quantitative Approaches to Higher Education Management: Potential, Limits, and Challenge. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education and American Association for Higher Education, 1977.

Leach, Ernest R. "Implementing the Marketing Process." Community and Junior College Journal, December/January, 1977-78, 20-24.

Lenning, Oscar T. Previous Attempts to Structure Educational Outcomes and Outcome-Related Concepts: A Compilation and Review of the Literature. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977.

Lenning, Oscar T. The Outcomes Structure: An Overview and Procedures For Applying it in Postsecondary-Education Institutions. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977.

Lenning, Oscar T., Lee, Yong S., Micek, Sidney S., and Service, Allan L. A Structure for the Outcomes of Postsecondary Education. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977.

Levine, Arthur. Handbook On Undergraduate Curriculum. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1978.

* Lippitt, Gordon L. Organization Renewal: Achieving Viability in a Changing World. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Lombardi, John. "Community College Financing In The Post-Proposition 13 Era." ERIC Junior College Resource Review, January, 1979.

Lombardi, John. Noncampus Colleges: New Governance Patterns For Outreach Programs. Los Angeles, California: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, University of California, March, 1977.

Mann, Richard L., Thomas, Charles R., Williams, Richard C., and Wallhaus, Robert A. An Overview of Two Recent Studies of Administrative Computer Operations in Higher Education. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1975.

* Margulies, Newton, and Raia, Anthony P. Organizational Development: Values, Process, and Technology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

McClenney, Byron N. "The President as Manager." Community and Junior College Journal, April, 1978, 26, 31-33.

* McGregor, Douglas. The Professional Manager. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

McGregor, Douglas, in John R. Sargent, What An Executive Should Know About Leadership. Chicago, Ill.: The Dartnell Corporation, 1975.

* McIntyre, Catherine E., and Wales, Christy A. Evaluation of a Non-Traditional College: Costs and Effectiveness. Seattle: Washington State Board for Community College Education, 1976.

McManis Associates, Inc./University Associates, Inc. A Guide To The Development Of Mission, Goals, Objectives, Performance Evaluation Measures, and Milestones. Washington, D. C.

Micek, Sidney S., "An Approach To Outcome Measures Definition, Collection, and Use." Outcome Measurements in Higher Education, L. James Harvey, Contributing Editor. Washington, D.C.: McManis Associates, Inc. for the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Vol. 1, No. 3.

Micek, Sidney S., and Arney, William Ray. Outcome-Oriented Planning in Higher Education: An Approach or An Impossibility? Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1973.

Millett, John D., Editor. Planning in Higher Education, A Manual For Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Academy For Educational Development, Inc., July, 1977.

Millett, John D. Strengthening Community In Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Management Division, Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1974.

* Myers, M. Scott. Every Employee a Manager: More Meaningful Work Through Job Enrichment. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

National Association of College and University Business Officers. A College Planning Cycle: People Resources Process. Washington, D.C.: NACUBO, 1975.

* National Association of College and University Business Officers and National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. Procedures for Determining Historical Full Costs. 2d ed. Technical Report 65. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977.

NCHEMS, P. O. Drawer P, Boulder, Colorado 80302

* Odiorne, George S. *Management by Objectives*. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, June, 1972.

Parekh, Satish B. *Long-Range Planning: An Institution-Wide Approach to Increasing Academic Vitality*. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1977.

Pray, Francis C. *A New Look at Community College Boards of Trustees and Presidents and Their Relationships*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975.

* Priest, Bill J. and Pickelman, John E. *Increasing Productivity In The Community College: An Action-Oriented Approach*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976.

Resource Center for Planned Change. *A Futures Creating Paradigm: A Guide to Long-Range Planning from the Future for the Future*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for State Colleges and Universities, 1978.

* Richardson, Richard, Blocker, Clyde E., and Bender, Louis W. Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Richardson, Richard C. "Needed: New Directions in Administration." *Junior College Journal*, March, 1970, 16-22.

Romney, Leonard C., Gray, Robert G., and Weldon, H. Kent. "Departmental Productivity: A Conceptual Framework." Internal Document. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1978.

Roueche, John E., Baker George A., III, and Brownell, Richard L. *Accountability and The Community College*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1971.

Rushing, Joe B. *Changing Role Of The Community College President In The Face Of New Administrative Pressures*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976.

Sibson, Robert E. *Compensation*. New York: AMACOM, 1974.

Sibson, Robert E. *Increasing Employee Productivity*. New York: AMACOM, 1976.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. Volume XVII, Number 18, January 15, 1979.

The Professional Institute of AMA. *American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Presidents Management Seminar*. Dallas, Texas: October, 1974.

Van Voorhees, Curtis, King, Marilyn J., and Cwik, Peter J. *Community College - Community School Cooperation*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, March, 1977.

Vladeck, Bruce C. "Buildings and Budgets: The Overinvestment Crisis." *Change*, December-January, 1978-79, 36-40.

Wattenbarger, James L. and Starnes, Paul M. *Financial Support Patterns for Community Colleges*. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida, Institute of Higher Education, 1976.

Woolf, Henry Bosley, Editor in Chief. *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1977.

Young, James H. "Shotgunning for $." *Community and Junior College Journal*, November, 1978, 42-44.

Young, Robert B., Fletcher, Suzanne M., and Rue, Robert R. *Directions For The Future: An Analysis Of The Community Services Dimension of Community Colleges*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Community Education, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in cooperation with The Office of Community Education Research, University of Michigan, April, 1978.

CASE STUDIES

Representative institutions, selected in consultation with AACJC staff members, were visited in November and December, 1979, with the idea of describing institutional operations in light of the review of management practices. Visits were arranged to move one from a small, single-unit institution in a rural setting to a very large multi-unit operation in a major metropolitan setting. While the institutions visited are excellent colleges, no attempt is made to say they are the best or models. The colleges are viewed as representative of the wide range of public community colleges in the United States. Each institution was approached with a basic set of questions drawn from the review of management. The questions presented in Exhibit I were utilized in personal interviews and in a review of institutional documents and reports. It is hoped that in addition to providing background on the visits, the questions might also suggest criteria for a review of any community college.

Reviews of Southeastern Community College (North Carolina), Delta College (Michigan), and the Coast Community College District (California) are presented in narrative form. The narratives are based on interviews with persons at all levels of the institutions and a review of documents, with the thrust of each effort designed to answer the basic questions. The reviews, reflecting operations as of December, 1979, have been critiqued by institutional representatives to avoid factual errors.

SOUTHEASTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

General Description

Southeastern Community College, located in Whiteville, North Carolina, opened in 1965 to primarily serve Columbus County. The institution is a comprehensive, "open door" college serving approximately 1,850 credit and 1,500 non-credit students at any given time through its transfer, occupational and continuing education offerings. As a state-supported community college, the college has been guided by the General Statutes of North Carolina and the standards of the State Board of Education under which a Department of Community Colleges has coordinated the efforts of local institutions. The 12-member Board of Trustees is appointed with the County Commission, County Board of Education and the Governor each appointing four members. Approximately 165 full-time and 100 part-time employees work within an operating budget in excess of $3 million. Enrollment is equally split between full and part-time students, and about 20% of the students attend only evening classes. The institution is situated in a rural setting and is representative of the many single-unit colleges located in similar settings throughout the United States.

Review

There is a clearly defined service area (Columbus County), but approximately 30% of the students come from adjacent counties. In order to stay in touch with needs throughout the area, a variety of approaches are taken. Advisory committees, meetings with personnel officers from area industries, sessions with representatives of the media, and articulation conferences with high school teachers are all utilized. Particularly noteworthy is the articulation conference with high school teachers in which the teachers are paid a small stipend to work with college faculty on a discipline-to-discipline basis. An annual dinner for high school counselors and visitations by college groups to area universities also enable college personnel to both assess needs and properly advise SCC students.

The mission of the institution is clear; it is printed in college publications, and faculty and staff members seem to work to accomplish the mission. Service to students is the clear orientation, and the president reviews annually with the faculty and staff a set of overall goals designed to move the college according to the mission.

The organizational structure is clearly described in the Personnel Policy Handbook which is available to all employees. The Board is described as the policy-making group and the responsibility for the administration and operation of the college is vested in the president. It is policy for the Board to speak through the chairman to the president and through the president to the faculty and staff. Similarly, the faculty and staff are expected to speak through the president to the Board. Position descriptions for all administrators, faculty and staff are included in the Personnel Policy Handbook along with the policies and procedures governing the operation of the college. Deans of Instruction and Student Development, the Director of Development, and the Business Manager report directly to the President. All operating units are then organized under one of these top-level administrators. All major committees are described in the Handbook so that all personnel can understand the membership and function of the respective groups. Regular meeting times are included in the committee descriptions. The Southeastern Community College Bulletin, the Student Handbook, and the North Carolina Administrative Code (Chapter 4) are available to supplement the information contained in the Personnel Policy Handbook.

Several major campus councils function to enhance communication and serve in advisory and coordinating roles. The Executive Council includes the people who report directly to the President. This council meets each Monday and appears to be the primary coordinating body for college operations. Minutes are prepared to include marginal notations of assignments for the various administrators, thereby providing a ready reference for follow-up on activities. The Administrative Council brings together all supervisory personnel every other month for the purpose of information-sharing and to serve as a "sounding board" for the President. The Administrative Advisory Council also meets every other month, but it includes a cross-section of all campus groups including students. This representative group provides advice to the President on matters of general concern.

Other groups include the Faculty Senate which is clearly described as the "voice" of the faculty and operates under an adopted constitution. It works through an Executive Committee to communicate with the President and other administrative officers. Issues like class attendance and merit pay are examples of the items the Senate may discuss. Curricular matters flow through the Curriculum Committee which is chaired by the Dean of Instruction. More than 20 individuals serve on the committee to assure a broad base. Meetings are held each quarter and are conducted according to an established agenda. The Professional Development Committee, involving faculty members, is actively involved in discussing matters like student ratings of faculty, faculty ratings of administrators, and merit pay. Most of the other significant committee activity during 1979-80 revolves around an institutional self-study guided by a steering committee. Committees for each of the standards established by the Southern Association have been created to involve persons from all levels of the institution.

The various councils, committees, and periodic personnel meetings for all employees provide opportunities for communication regarding all issues, concerns, and priorities within the college. The personnel meetings are held each month and all employees are expected to attend. These sessions follow an agenda coordinated by the Dean of Instruction. Status reports and announcements regarding various projects are shared.

An "air of accountability" permeates SCC primarily as a result of the annual planning process. The process, a modified approach to MBO, involves setting objectives in late August or early September which will provide a basis for evaluation in the late Spring of the next year. While efforts are not made to quantify all objectives, stress is placed on quarterly reviews on progress. The deans, within some flexibility provided by the President, are responsible for conducting the reviews. All departments of the college are expected to be involved in the planning process. While SCC does not have a comprehensive planning process extending beyond the bounds of one year, there are long-range master plans for campus development and curriculum development. In addition, some annual objectives are recognized as current statements of longer-range projects and then extended for several years.

Articulation with universities provides information for planning the transfer courses and community advisory committees are involved with all technical/occupational programs. Recommendations from the advisory committees must flow through the Curriculum Committee before they are recommended to the President and the Board. New program proposals must also go to the Department of Community Colleges and the State Board of Education for approval. Documentation of need in the service area for the program must be included in proposals going to the State.

In an effort to determine how former students are performing, the college has done periodic surveys of transfer and occupational program students. Response rates have not been high (15-20%), but results indicate that transfers perform well and occupational students are finding employment. Additional survey work done recently included a follow-up of students who applied for admission and did not enroll, a review of the drop-add process, and a survey of women to determine levels of interest in athletics. A follow-up on retention of students who participated in developmental studies courses further illustrates the interest of the institution in determining its impact on students. There is also evidence that individual student complaints are given careful attention.

Attention to student needs is also demonstrated through a wide range of student services. Financial aid, counseling, student activities, assistance to veterans, and special programs for women and disadvantaged students demonstrate a desire to support student learning. Advising is led by a faculty member who is given released time to coordinate the efforts of all faculty members, many of whom advise 20 or more students. In order to provide comprehensive services, it has been necessary to combine roles like the personnel and counseling functions.

One person directs the counseling and personnel operations. She reports to the President in the personnel role and to the Dean for Student Development in the counseling area. The split reporting relationship apparently works because of the quality of working relationships among the parties involved. Another example of a combined role involves the development and public information functions. Combined roles and defined working relationships such as the interaction of the Business Manager and the Development Officer in grant development indicate effective coordination of college operations.

Coordination of the instructional area is facilitated by twice-monthly meetings conducted by the Dean of Instruction. Involved in these meetings are the dean-level leaders of the transfer, occupational, and adult education program leaders. The Evening Director, who serves as an advisor to evening students, and leaders of the developmental and library programs also participate in these information-sharing and planning sessions. Schedules are projected one year in advance, and working calendars are reviewed so that all persons pull together to accomplish the approved plans for the year. The leaders who report to the Dean of Instruction then work with department coordinators who are faculty members with released time to coordinate departmental activities. Department coordinators then work directly with instructors in the various disciplines and programs. All teachers are called instructors since there is no system of faculty ranks. While there is no system of tenure, initial employment and the terms of employment are structured to produce clarity for instructors. Due process and termination policies also are clearly stated in the Handbook.

The instructional staff strives to achieve a ratio of 22 FTE students to 1 FTE instructor, and cost data are calculated for faculty members and shared with the departments. These cost data are generated manually at present but there are hopes that the development of a computer-based information system will free personnel from manual computations. There are, however, State barriers to computer acquisition at the present time. An emphasis on planning, staff development, and performance-appraisal involving faculty members adds to the "air of accountability" felt throughout the institution. Discussions are taking place during 1979-80 regarding the place and determination of "merit" in salary increases. Student ratings have a place in the process, but there is considerable debate about the appropriate weighting of this factor. There is considerable evidence that faculty have been encouraged to attend conferences, take graduate courses, and attend workshops on campus. The institution was apparently able to make good use of AIDP funds to facilitate the staff development effort.

In addition to staff development efforts, considerable time has been spent on clarifying roles, classifying positions, appraising performance, and clarifying the bases for salary placement and salary increases. A six-year effort is underway to achieve internal equity for faculty salaries. A formula has been developed to take into account preparation, experience, and annual merit to determine contract amounts. At present, the experienced members are the ones to be held back until the structure can be fully implemented. In addition, salary ranges have been developed for all classified positions, each of which is based on a position description. All faculty and staff members are encouraged to develop a professional development or personal plan, the accomplishment of which will contribute to the merit consideration in salary determinations. As with most institutions, available resources do not stretch to cover all aspirations regarding compensation.

Since State appropriations are based on enrollment during the previous year, the institution is really a year behind on the formula funding. State funding also includes some restricted lines which further limit the institutional flexibility. To compensate for the funding lag and lack of flexibility, the College has been forced to be proactive in seeking resources. Effective presentations to the County Commission have produced an amount equal to about 6% of the operating budget to be applied to operation of the physical plant. Creation of an energy conservation program and careful line-item comparisons have helped the staff demonstrate accountability to the Commission. Since the buildings incorporate approximately 142,000 square feet on a 106-acre campus, the relationship with the County will continue to be important. Good use was made of an AIDP grant and a new three-year SDIP grant has been approved. The College also has a foundation which has an annual fund drive ($40,000 goal) to help supplement other sources of revenue. Resulting scholarships for students serve as a vital part of the marketing efforts. A number of small grants round-out the resource picture for SCC since all tuition collected is forwarded to the State. Student activity fees are retained to provide a base for student activity programs. An appropriate program to enhance retention of students was discussed in a recent personnel meeting, with stress placed on the fact that headcount enrollment is now stable. The implications in a formula-funded situation are clear and most staff members seem determined to increase retention rates. Attention to retention rates certainly holds promise for SCC in view of the stable headcount enrollment.

Assessment

Southeastern Community College is well organized and appears to be fulfilling its mission in Columbus County, North Carolina. The Board has high regard for the President and his role as the chief operating officer. Significant efforts are extended to involve persons at all levels of the organization in the process of internal governance. Policies and procedures are clearly stated and available to all faculty and staff members. Attention has been given to annual planning, performance-appraisal, and staff development in ways to produce an "air of accountability" which is both a positive feature and a future challenge for the institution.

The College will be challenged to maintain a balance between the concerns for production or performance and people-oriented concerns related to the freedom to create and respond in flexible ways to changes in the environment. The annual planning and follow-up activities should keep the institution moving toward reaching its goals, but care must be taken to avoid a paper-oriented, time-consuming process which could frustrate individual initiative and hurt morale. The College seems to be up to this challenge.

Development of an integrated data base for the information system, acquisition of additional computer hardware, completion of plans for salary equity, resolution of the debate on merit pay, and possible extension of the planning activity beyond the bounds of one year would seem to hold promise for SCC in the future. The SDIP grant comes at a good time for an institution which apparently made good use of AIDP funds. Good leadership has been provided, the Board is supportive, and management processes are in place to help the College adapt to the challenges of its future.

DELTA COLLEGE

General Description

Delta College, founded in 1961, enrolls more than 9,000 students in credit courses at any given time. Approximately 200 full-time and more than 300 part-time teachers staff the diverse offerings. In addition, 170 administrative, support and classified personnel work to serve residents of the Midland-Bay City-Saginaw area of Michigan. The institution is a comprehensive, "open door" college providing instruction on a large campus, in more than 20 off-campus centers, and via open-circuit television. Enrollment appears to be equally split between college transfer courses and a wide array of occupational programs. Non-credit enrollment also is spread across diverse community education offerings. A nine-member board elected by voters in a three-county area oversees operation of the institution, with funding provided by a local millage (38%), state support (33%), tuition and fees (26%), and grants or other outside sources (3%). College operations are conducted within an operating budget approaching $17 million. Enrollment is drawn from a service-area population of more than 400,000 located in a region with a mix of major industries and agricultural interests. Delta College is representative of the many large, single-unit colleges located throughout the United States.

Review

There is a clearly defined service area in which Delta has become highly visible. Mailing of schedules and brochures to residents, operation of a public television station, establishment of off-campus centers, and a well-funded marketing effort seem to have contributed to the acceptance in the various communities. Use of numerous advisory committees and techniques like including a needs survey form in schedules have helped the staff stay in touch with community needs, even though no comprehensive surveys have been done in the tri-county area.

The Senate Handbook contains a mission statement and a set of major goals adopted by the Board in 1976. The goals have recently been augmented by the introduction of "Dimension '80" which has been described by the president as a way of inviting interested college personnel to join in an effort to examine critical concerns for the next decade. Some personnel were not sure how to respond to what was seen as a change in style on the part of a president whose tenure reaches back to 1964. Both the introduction of a new thrust by the president and an uncertain response by faculty and staff can be understood when one observes the longstanding "family" atmosphere on the campus. The College has also been visible, successful and innovative when suddenly, along with many others, the institution must face stabilizing enrollment, raging inflation and the pressures brought about by legislative questioning about the future funding of higher education. In that mix of outside pressures, people on campus are beginning to talk about how they can plan their future.

College personnel are also realizing the need to step up the activity level in community needs-assessment. In the past it has been enough to offer a wide array of credit and non-credit courses, market the offerings through an effective promotional campaign and scramble to find ways to serve the incoming students. While advisory committees have been helpful in the past, people are now talking about a comprehensive survey of needs in the tri-county service-area of the college. More formal survey work has, however, been done within the College. Delta was a pilot institution for the Educational Testing Service Student Reaction to College program and several follow-up studies have been completed in recent years.

The concern for students, evident when one talks with faculty and staff, underlies the organization of the College. From what faculty and staff consider to be an enlightened board to a president who wants to create an atmosphere in which people can get things done, support has been provided for diverse and innovative programming. There has been very little stress on codification of rules and regulations and, in fact, there is no formal policies and procedures handbook. The Senate Handbook fills the role to some extent, but during the growth years there has been little felt need for a more formal approach. There is a clear understanding that policies are created at the board level, procedures are developed as needed to implement policy and guidelines are frequently issued to provide guidance for various activities. The situation has been good for Delta because of a stable board and continuity at the presidential level. In fact, two children of original board members are currently serving on the nine-member board.

Board members are kept informed through monthly meetings in which the agenda includes a preview of future agenda items, items for action, a review of future events of significance to members and a presentation of general information covering a wide range of topics. Communications from the board flow through the president in most instances, but there are situations in which board members are directly involved with faculty and staff. For example, sabbatical leave requests and grievances come before groups including board representation. The president has no problem describing the board members as his "bosses" who expect him to provide administrative direction and keep them informed.

The internal organization has been structured so that ten key staff members report to the president. Deans of academic affairs, student affairs, community affairs and administrative affairs report directly to the president along with an assistant and leaders in college relations, television, research and development and personnel. The controller and a business manager also report to the chief executive. These leaders come together with three faculty members to form the Administrative Council which meets only when the president is present to conduct the meeting. The meetings tend to be devoted to information-sharing and coordination of work rather than to institutional decision-making. The Academic Council, on the other hand, appears to be more involved in the decision-making process.

The Academic Council includes all division chairmen from instruction, representatives from the LRC and student affairs and the three associate deans who rotate the chairmanship. In addition to information-sharing and coordination, the group formulates recommendations in instruction and curriculum. It is worth noting that the chairmen are selected to serve three-year terms as division heads following the nomination of three candidates by division faculty members. The person selected as chairman is then given release from teaching assignments during the term of office—in some cases a full release, and in others less, depending on the number of disciplines and the number of faculty in a division.

The major policy recommending body in the college is the Senate. This group, in place since the early 1960's, was created on the basis of the AAUP "Joint Statement." The existence of the Senate is often cited as the reason that Delta is only one of two community colleges in Michigan without a faculty union. Avoidance of a "we-they" attitude is also cited as an outcome of this representative group of faculty and professional staff. The president serves on the executive committee of the Senate and often takes recommendations directly to the Board following deliberations of the Senate.

People on campus clearly perceive that path as a primary way for policy issues to flow through to the Board. Members of the Faculty Executive Committee in particular see referral of policy items to the Senate as the way to process recommendations.

The Senate Handbook contains appointment procedures for personnel, procedures for promotion and tenure, grievance procedures, the process for requesting sabbatical leaves, evaluation procedures, and the application for educational grants. As mentioned earlier, the publication serves for the faculty and professional staff as a policies and procedures handbook.

In addition to the Administrative and Academic Councils and the Senate, the Budget Committee fills a key role in college operations. This group includes the chief fiscal officer who serves as permanent vice-chairman of the committee. The representative committee including three faculty members appointed by the president, has a rotating membership thereby exposing many people to the pressures and challenges of balancing a budget. The committee charge is to recommend to the president an operating budget for the next fiscal year. The work of the group is launched in December when members receive current budget detail, a set of working definitions, and a budget message from the president and the fiscal officer. Meetings start in early February and budget hearings are held beginning in the middle of February. Each college unit makes a presentation prior to an effort by the committee to structure a recommended budget. Included in the review work will be a projection of credit hours by activity cost centers.

Future work of the budget committee is going to be difficult because a State index places Delta as number 28 out of 29 institutions in state aid per student. There is also a "cap" of a 7.7% increase in local income above the level for last year which is imposed by state guidelines. In addition, Delta tuition rates are the second highest among all community colleges. Coupled with a stable enrollment, the income limitations are causing people on campus to realize the importance of establishing institutional priorities for the allocation and re-allocation of resources. It is safe to predict a growing interest in long-range planning among various groups on campus.

One of the challenges for Delta will be to pull together the wealth of available information from several data bases into an integrated information system for decision-making. The necessary ingredients are present such as an interest in research, evidence of previous costing studies, computer hardware, and a need to have more information in the establishment of budget priorities. A number of computer applications like on-line registration, inventory control and accounting reports indicates that Delta has the equipment and the talent to extend its system to include an on-line personnel system desired by the personnel officer.

The realm of personnel systems is an area in which considerable work is underway, particularly work with classified staff. There is a 10-member Classified Personnel Policies Committee meeting on a monthly basis, and a Classified Job Description Review Committee is now in place. A classification of all jobs on the basis of job content utilizing a point system should be complete during 1979-80. All positions will be placed in pay grades which include steps for salary increments. Evaluation of performance will then be based on the job description. Stress is also being placed on helping supervisors downplay personality as a factor in evaluations. The apparent stress on identifying required skills and experience required of one who will fill any job, the specification of major duties and responsibilities, and the linking of evaluation with the job description should provide a solid basis for continued open communication which appears to be a characteristic of working relationships at Delta.

Excellent salaries and wages also work together with good relationships to keep satisfaction at a high level. There is an apparent "policy" decision to keep salaries and wages in the top one-third for all community colleges in Michigan. Impending pressures are evident, however, when one observes that 83% of the operating budget is in salaries, wages and fringe benefits. In an effort to keep benefits high and costs low, the college recently developed its own Dental Assistance Allowance Plan.

Delta has had a low turnover rate in both the faculty and classified ranks due in part to the "family" feeling, good compensation levels, and desirable living conditions in the area. Given the stable enrollment picture and the fact that many faculty and staff members have been there for many years, staff development will assume a more important role. Faculty members are talking about how to avoid "burn out" and others are talking about how to maintain the characteristic high standards for performance. Those elements work together to provide a good climate for staff development activities. The resources are available as evidenced by the fact that the institution makes available more than $100,000 in a fiscal year for professional development allowances and travel. The desire to maintain a quality, innovative institution should add impetus to staff development efforts.

There is one group likely to be overlooked in an institution experiencing rapid growth and success. That group includes middle-managers and even top-level administrators in some settings. When things are going well and resources are abundant, there is little motivation to clarify roles and reporting lines and focus on compensation of these managers. When resources shrink and when priorities must be put in place, these managers are in key roles and need clarity regarding how their units should relate to all others. They also need to know when they can make decisions and when they need to refer items. It is also predictable that when they feel new pressures they will begin to wonder about the basis for evaluation and determination of compensation. All of the above-mentioned variables are surfacing at Delta, but given the high level of trust and support for personnel, the institution is in a better position than most to provide clarification leading to continued high performance of the administrative team. A by-product of clarification at Delta is likely to be enhanced coordination across lines in the organization.

Concern for people, a characteristic cited several times, also surfaces in the effort to keep people informed about college operations. There is a daily "Bulletin" for students so they may be aware of the diverse programs and also to make them aware of important announcements. The "Interlink" is published each week to fill the same role for all personnel.

Concern for students, so obvious in diverse student services and alternative instructional strategies, has carried over into a review of student attrition. Project S.T.A.Y., involving volunteer faculty and staff members, is seeking to improve the retention rate of new students. More than 100 volunteers are each seeking to establish a relationship with 10 to 12 new students in order to help the students make a smooth transition to college life. College services are explained and referrals are made to provide a "support structure" for the students. Delta has certainly perceived that one way to cope with stabilizing enrollment is to focus on service to and retention of current students.

Another way to cope with declining resources has been perceived by Delta personnel. Conservation and consolidating efforts are beginning to pay dividends for the institution. A secretarial "pool" of three "floaters" has brought greater efficiency, a computer-managed air conditioning and heating system should conserve energy, leasing of surplus land to farmers will produce income, buying of gasoline in volume has reduced costs, and use of student employees to pick-up supplies from local vendors has enhanced service to college units. The examples illustrate the potential at Delta for cost-savings without a sacrifice of desirable quality levels. There also appears to be a growing interest in an analysis of room utilization on campus which could lead to greater efficiency. Again, the climate at Delta is conducive to planning a secure future.

Assessment

Delta College is a successful, visible and innovative community college. It cooperates with community agencies, faculty and staff members are proud to be involved, and students are able to select from a diverse "menu" of formal and informal learning opportunities. Stability and continuity have been present at the board and presidential levels, and financing has been more than adequate to enable the institution to be a leader in commumity college education. A "family" atmosphere has helped the college avoid the typical "we-they" relationships. In summary, Delta is a strong institution. It will be in a good position to cope with the pressures of the next decade if identified challenges can be met.

People at all levels of the college are beginning to perceive the significant challenges. More extensive needs-assessment in the community, establishment of funding priorities on the basis of program needs, staff development to maintain the vitality of faculty and staff, clarification of administrative roles, consolidation of data bases into an integrated information system, and establishment of a planning process seem to head the agenda for Delta. The institution may also face a need to codify more of its policies and procedures in order to achieve clarity and the proper coordination necessary to plan the future in the face of stable enrollment, inflation and declining resources. The college definitely seems to be up to the challenge.

COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

General Description

The Coast Community College District operates three community colleges and an open-circuit television station along the coastal area of Orange County, California.

There are more than half-a-million residents in the eight cities comprising the district. It is reported that the system ranks number one in the United States with citizen participation in courses and community service activities. Providing the pervices are two campus-based colleges and a district-wide college without a campus. Orange Coast College opened in 1947 in the city of Costa Mesa followed in 1966 by the opening of Golden West College in Huntington Beach. Coastline, the college without walls, opened in 1976 to extend lifelong learning opportunities for all district residents.

The system serves more than 30,000 in ADA (Average Daily Attendance) which at any given time may approach 70,000 headcount in credit offerings. Community Service participations number in the hundreds-of-thousands during a fiscal year. Total income and expenditures including capital projects and auxiliary operations approach $70 million. Since no tuition is charged, revenue has historically come from district taxes (40%), State allocations (39%), federal (8%), and other sources completing the balance. The state revenue percentage has now moved to approximately 75% following the passage of Proposition 13. The multiple thousands of students are served by a full-time equivalent certificated staff of more than 1,000. In addition, hundreds of classified staff provide support services.

The colleges and KOCE-TV provide offerings as diverse and comprehensive as any to be found in the United States. The system is also representative of the large multi-unit operations found in the metropolitan areas of the country. It is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees whose individual terms run for four years.

Review

Operation of the district within prescribed boundaries is in accord with California's Master Plan for Higher Education. Within the service-area there are clear guidelines on the role to be played by each institution. A "home college" concept is used to designate primary responsibility for each program and the courses comprising the program. Courses within programs may be offered by sister colleges with permission from the college with primary responsibility. All institutions have comprehensive transfer offerings. Geographic criteria have been developed to establish boundaries for community service (non-credit) offerings like a lecture series. Orange Coast and Golden West are responsible for everything offered on their respective campuses and Coastline is responsible for all offerings in the system which are not physically located on one of the two campuses. Exceptions will be by mtutal agreement of the college presidents with the concurrence of the chancellor.

The chief executive employed by the board is the chancellor to whom all the college presidents report. The incumbent has been the chief executive since 1963, illustrating the stability and continuity characteristic of the Coast District. Board members have been supportive, active in professional associations, and clear on the difference between policy-making and administration. The chancellor has been expected to keep the system in the forefront of the community college movement, an expectation translated into an acceptance of risk-taking on the part of top administrators and the institutions. The colleges have been given considerable autonomy as evidenced by three very different patterns of organization.

The board meets twice each month to consider lengthy agendas. Information-sharing may consume most of the meeting before action items are considered. In addition to information items there will be a consent calendar, personnel reports coded by college, course revisions, textbook approvals, approval of warrants, approval of bids and change orders, authorization of student trips, conference attendance approvals, salary schedule changes and other items submitted by the chancellor on behalf of the colleges. In summary, a Coast District board member will be very well informed regarding all aspects of district and college operations.

The district staff reporting to the chancellor is small considering the magnitude of the operation. Included are the executive vice-chancellor for business, a vice-chancellor for employee-relations, a vice-chancellor for educational planning and vocational education, the general counsel and directors for information services, physical facilities, community relations and telecommunications. These officers comprise the Chancellor's Cabinet which is not directly involved in policy formulation. The Chancellor's Council which meets "on call" is directly involved in developing policy recommendations. Membership includes the key district office administrators, the presidents and faculty senate chairmen from the colleges. The chancellor also views this group as a primary "sounding board" for new ideas.

The colleges utilize groups similar to the Chancellor's Council as primary policy recommending groups. Orange Coast has an Administrative Cabinet including 11 division chairmen, the deans, and representatives of the Faculty

Senate and the Associated Students. This group meets three times each month. Golden West has a 20-member College Council which meets once every three weeks. Included in the group are administrators, faculty members, classified staff and students. Coastline has a 30-member, representative Advisory Council which meets on the first Wednesday of each month.

Reference has been made to the role of the faculty senates both on the campuses and at the district level and a special note about an important transition is in order. The system is involved for the first time in collective bargaining with the AFT as the agent for full-time faculty and the California Teachers Association (CTA) as the agent for part-time faculty. The latter group becomes the central group for Coastline since it has only 25 full-time teachers and literally hundreds of part-time instructors. While the various senate representatives hope that their groups will retain their former role in academic decision-making, 1979-80 is definitely a year of transition and uncertainty. Classified staff are in their second year under a negotiated contract, and this too is introducing a new dimension as bargaining on wages is undertaken during 1979-80. These changes would be dramatic in any setting, but given the past success of the Coast District while maintaining informality, a sense of pride, trusting relationships and a sense of "family," the uncertainty is understandable.

One is driven to talk about pre-13 and post-13 in talking about the district. Resources were abundant and innovation was encouraged prior to Proposition 13, but following the passage there was a ripple of insecurity throughout the district. There is concern about loss of local control since state funding will now comprise 80% or more of the revenue. There was also a major concern about a reduction in total revenue available to operate the district. An expected reduction of 15% during 1978-79 was actually an 8% reduction. The reduction led to some reduction in force primarily through attrition, by not filling vacant positions, and through some personnel transfers within the system. An expected enrollment decline in 1979-80 did not materialize and the expected decline in revenue may actually be converted to an increase of seven or eight percent. Still when one considers the rate of inflation and the decline in revenue during 1978-79, it is clear that it could not be "business as usual" in the Coast District. Where once almost any good idea could be funded, there is now talk about pressure on reserves and re-allocation of resources. Where once there had been a real feeling of "family," there is now the uncertainty of collective bargaining results. An examination of the official response to the dramatic changes should certainly be helpful to others who face similar pressures.

Included in objectives set by the board for 1979-80 are the following:

1. Increase retention district-wide by 10%
2. Achieve an ADA of 30,500.
3. Establish mutually satisfactory agreements with the AFT and CTA.
4. Develop a community assessment proposal that will result in current data for future planning.
5. Prepare long-range (5-year) plans for KOCE and for Information Services.
6. Revise and update the Board Policies and Procedures Manual.
7. Maintain and improve internal and external communications.
8. Increase the number of students in the television market by 15%.
9. Increase external funding for television activities by 20%.
10. Develop additional contacts with high school students to generate interest in attending community college.

Increasing retention, community assessment, planning, updating policies and procedures, enhancing communication, proactive resource development, and recruitment of students comprise the agenda for Coast and hundreds of community colleges across the country.

By virtue of its newness and non-traditional nature, Coastline may be in the best position to respond quickly to the new pressures identified in the objectives for 1979-80. It has been involved in considerable community assessment during three and one-half years of operation. It is also noteworthy that Coastline was the first non-campus institution to receive full accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The organization of the service-area into four administrative areas with the line administrators (associate deans) in the field, a mail registration process utilized by two-thirds of the students, the student average age of 38, the utilization of more than 700 part-time instructors, and the utilization of numerous community facilities combine to give Coastline an ability to be flexible and adapt in ways that more traditional colleges are unable to reach.

Orange Coast with its emphasis on a flat organizational structure and with stress placed on communication processes also has the ability to adapt with changing priorities. The changing priorities within the district are raising concerns, however, about what some refer to as "over-management" as a potential problem in the future. Given the fact that this was the first college and that many faculty and staff members have been there for years, it is easy to understand the concern that future changes might take away autonomy and campus flexibility.

Golden West recently completed a reorganization which resulted in the elimination of instructional divisions and consolidated instruction into three institutes of about 3,500 FTE students each. The consolidation coupled with extensive work in setting priorities leading up to the reduction of resources has prepared the faculty and staff to understand the thrust identified by the Board objectives for 1979-80.

Each institution in its own way has the ability to adapt to future pressures, but the challenge is going to be how to coordinate the efforts on a district-wide basis. Each of the colleges, again in their own way, has organizational clarity. They also have had the ability to fund "wish lists" in the past. Further, they have had considerable autonomy so that decisions could be made "close to the action" in the words of the chancellor. Given relatively different college patterns of development and given present district needs as reflected in the objectives, integrated planning will become more important for the system. Related to the planning thrust will be the need to develop information for planning and decision-making, a need recognized by people at all levels of the system.

It should be noted that Coast has had a computing center since 1958, but in recent years the computing power available has not been fully utilized for an integrated information system. Extensive computer-assisted instruction has been supported, however, particularly at the two campus-based colleges. Personnel at several levels are beginning to realize where the system has "missing links" in information processing. It is likely that a higher priority for administrative functions will emerge both in response to perceived needs and to meet the needs for state reports which can be used to good advantage as management tools within the district. A complete information system could easily emerge given the computing power, the wealth of available information and the perceived need to integrate the system.

There was a planning task formed following the passage of Proposition 13 and this group made an excellent start in preparation of information for planning. However, with the availability of sufficient state funds to avert a major crisis, the need for planning moved to a lower priority and the group became somewhat inactive. In addition, many units in the district and on the campuses have done some planning, but what staff members are perceiving as the need is to develop an integrated process that involves the operational units throughout the district. Many are seeing the need to move beyond the usual budget preparation activity.

There has been a district budget committee working in an advisory relationship to the executive vice-chancellor for business. This 16-member body involves faculty, staff and administrators from the colleges and the television station. The group reviews the financial condition of the district, conducts studies of selected operations, and stays in touch with legislation which may have an impact on the funding level. The "missing link" in this activity, as perceived by some participants, is a sense of priority on what is desirable. The integrated planning process, supported by the integrated information system, can provide the priorities sought by members of the budget committee. These elements will certainly be in place if the district reaches its objectives for 1979-80. If the past sets the pattern for the future, actual budget-making will in itself continue to be a "ground up" process from division-to-college-to-district.

There is one major centralized function in this system which has created so much individual autonomy for its colleges. The personnel function is handled in the district office, a placement which is likely to be solidified with the onset of collective bargaining with the various employee groups. The system has a position classification structure and classified salaries are determined from a district-wide table. There are five steps within each grade of the wage structure and an employee reaches the maximum salary in four and one-half years. Individual classified employees do not necessarily have unique position descriptions, but each one is assigned to a system-wide description. The district plans to conduct a position audit by external evaluations within the next year to determine the effectiveness of the classification structure.

The personnel office is directly involved in position announcements, changes in position descriptions, compliance activity and in facilitating the personnel evaluation activity. The procedures that are followed seem to be generally understood even though all procedures have not been included in a handbook or manual for general use. This understanding is most likely linked to the longstanding "family" feeling and high morale. Proposition 13 and the subsequent anxiety and the advent of collective bargaining will likely push the district to formalize in writing the procedures to be followed in personnel matters. The fact that salaries and wages have been high in the past would also seem to explain the relative stability. Faculty and staff members realize they have been in the top 10% for salaries and benefits in California community colleges, a ranking sought through a "policy position" taken by the board.

Related to good salaries in attracting and holding good personnel has been a supportive staff development program. The program has utilized the many higher education institutions in the area. Employees are provided tuition and fee support and leaves with partial salary support in some cases. Increasing interest is also being expressed for more job-related, in-house programming. The interest in more in-house programs should help the district and the colleges cope with the pressures of the future by providing for more involvement on the part of employees at all levels.

Increased interest in the needs of people has not been limited to faculty and staff. Follow-up surveys of students using a sampling technique are likely to be expanded if current plans are completed. There is interest at all levels of the district in doing more community assessment, in reviewing programs to see if they are meeting needs and then in "fine tuning" programs to utilize what is discovered. The district seems to be moving from simple promotion of programs, which has been successful, to incorporation of a full marketing concept which takes into account the results of research done within and outside the institutions.

Assessment

The Coast District has been strong and successful both collectively (district) and individually (colleges), and separate case studies could be written on numerous innovations undertaken during recent years. Funding has been adequate, as demonstrated by the fact that the campuses are debt free and that salaries have been kept in the top 10% for California community colleges. Stability and leadership characterize the top administrators, and the district has been boosted by a professional and forward-looking board. Considerable autonomy has been delegated to the colleges and this has been appreciated by campus personnel. There has been room for considerable creativity and risk-taking which in turn has led to the development of an impressive array of instructional opportunities, student services and community services. The district is now facing unprecedented change, however, as a result of Proposition 13 and the advent of collective bargaining.

The board has recognized the challenges of the future in creation of objectives for 1979-80. Community assessment, integration of an information system, development of a planning process to involve operational units, updating policies and procedures, focus on recruitment and retention of students, and working to maintain and enhance communication during a time of transition comprise an exciting agenda for the future. The Coast District is uncommonly well prepared to face these challenges. What it must do is to follow through on identified paths for the future.

EXHIBIT I

MANAGEMENT FOR PRODUCTIVITY

Case-Study Questions	Yes	No	Work Underway
1. Are there clear service-area boundaries?			
2. Do you have ongoing processes in place to determine educational needs in the service-area?			
3. Is the college (district) mission clearly defined?			
4. Is the mission based on needs in the service-area?			
5. Do you have evidence that college (district) employees are committed to the mission?			
6. Do you have clearly defined college (district) goals?			
7. Is the organizational structure clearly defined?			
8. Is program development based on needs-assessment data?			
9. Are the manpower needs of service-area employers well understood by college (district) staff members?			
10. Are community advisory committees involved in the development and evaluation of programs?			
11. Are there regular efforts extended to determine the extent to which constituencies have been satisfied?			
12. Are college policies and procedures readily available to all employees?			
13. Is the process of governance clearly defined?			
14. Are the various administrative roles clearly defined?			
15. Do you have a systematic planning process in operation?			
16. Are resources allocated on the basis of systematic planning?			
17. Does the planning process extend beyond the bounds of one fiscal year?			
18. Are the efforts of the various units of the college (district) coordinated to move the institution toward accomplishment of goals?			

	Yes	No	Work Underway
19. Do you have position descriptions for all employees?			
20. Do you have a process for the appraisal of individual performance?			
21. Do you have a clearly understood policy on salary and wage administration?			
22. Are efforts made to relate costs to benefits or outcomes?			
23. Are processes in place to determine whether or not events conform to plans?			
24. Do you have a management information system which provides appropriate and timely information for decision-making?			
25. Is there a "positive regard" between the CEO and the board?			
26. Are college administrators aware of the extent to which they establish the organizational climate?			
27. Are participative patterns of leader and group behavior encouraged?			
28. Are high standards set for individual and college unit performance?			
29. Are personnel systems viewed as satisfactory by employees?			
30. Do employees experience high levels of job satisfaction?			
31. Are there staff development programs for all employee groups?			
32. Is there an organized marketing or public relations program?			
33. Is the college (district) proactive in resource development?			
34. Is there information available regarding student attrition rates?			
35. Are efforts being extended to reduce student attrition?			

	Yes	No	Work Underway
36. Is the college (district) collecting evidence of student learning?			
37. Do you conduct follow-up studies of graduates and former students?			
38. Are there cooperative ventures with other community agencies?			
39. Are efforts extended to measure efficiency?			
40. Are efforts being extended to increase productivity?			

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
OCT 17 1980

Byron N. McClenney
October, 1979